

service by rail and water; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4484. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the continental shelf lying outside of State boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4485. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement national forest timber in amounts not exceeding \$2,000 in appraised value; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FUGATE:

H. R. 4486. A bill to provide for a cost-of-living increase in the rates of compensation of policemen and firemen employed by the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4487. A bill to readjust postal rates and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4488. A bill granting to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children pensions equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4489. A bill to increase the period of education or training to which veterans of World War II are entitled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 4490. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948, so as to provide that disability and death benefits based on military service may be excluded from net income in establishing rents for certain low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4491. A bill to amend section 2 of the Missing Persons Act, so as to provide that benefits thereunder shall be available to certain members of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. J. Res. 270. Joint resolution continuing for a temporary period certain provisions of law relating to import controls for fats and oils (including butter) and for rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the Rumanian people from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 259. Resolution favoring an armistice in the Korean War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. Res. 260. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript comprising reports on the basic physical and economic features of water resources and photosynthesis as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 261. Resolution reestablishing principles stated in Executive Order 8802 of June 25, 1941, as amended, and requesting the President to provide for fair employment practices; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 4492. A bill for the relief of Norma J. Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4493. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Radich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 4494. A bill for the relief of Carmella Zuccarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD of Idaho:

H. R. 4495. A bill for the relief of Lee Yim Quon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Frederick E. Morse, post chaplain, Fort Jay, Governors Island, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, the Father of all mankind, we yield Thee hearty thanks for all Thy goodness and loving kindness to us and to all men. As we stand in this place of service make us to have a true appreciation of our heritage, of the great men and great deeds which have gone before us, and help us to feel our inadequacy without Thee as we face the problems of this troubled hour. Direct and prosper our President, the Members of this body, and all others in authority in the great work of government which is theirs, that all accomplished herein will be to the advancement of Thy glory, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people.

We pray this day for a blessing on our Nation. Make us strong in our devotion to truth; great in our desire for honor; wise in our labors with the nations of men; ready to sacrifice all else, but never righteousness or virtue. Strengthen us all that we may walk with Thee as we carry burdens of responsibility. Guide us that in honorable service and humility of spirit we may bring peace by doing Thy will. Thus help us at all times to seek and see Thy plan, and may our faith be seen in our works.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 15, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 15, 1951:

S. 276. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander V. Pananicolau and his wife Emilia; and S. 872. An act to furnish emergency food aid to India.

On June 16, 1951:

S. 362. An act for the relief of Tu Do Chau (also known as Szetu Dju or Anna Szetu); and

S. 364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Wiernik and her daughter, Genevieve.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORSE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 45)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of \$200,000, for the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1952, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Exchange Stabilization Fund, together with a summary of operations of the fund from its establishment to June 30, 1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes

only, certain alien seamen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DISPLACED PERSONS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States of certain displaced persons (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of joint resolution 22, adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii, requesting the Congress to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, by amending the first sentence of section 202 (a) thereof, relating to membership on the Hawaiian Homes Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TITLE TO CHICALE DAY SCHOOL SITE, NEW MEXICO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare title to the Chicale Day School site to be vested in the United States in trust for the Pueblo of Islet (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the United States Maritime Administration under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to registration of foreign freight forwarders, for the periods September 1, through December 31, 1950, and January 1, 1951, to April 31, 1951 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Security Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the National Security Council entitled "NSC Determination No. 1: An Interim General Exception Under Section 1302 of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951"; "NSC Determination No. 2: Trade Between Austria and the Soviet Bloc in the Light of Section 1302 of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951," and "NSC Determination No. 3: Trade Between Norway and the Soviet Bloc in the Light of Section 1302 of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951", together with certain confidential matter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON HOME LOAN BANK BOARD, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION, AND HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Home Loan Bank

Board, the Federal home loan banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, for the year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution congratulating Justice George W. Latimer upon his appointment as a justice of the United States Court of Military Appeals

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

"Whereas the President of the United States of America has seen fit to appoint Justice George W. Latimer, of the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, to the office of justice of the United States Court of Military Appeals; and

"Whereas Justice Latimer has served with distinction and honor as a member of the bar and the bench of this State, and as an officer in the Army of the United States, and the National Guard of the State of Utah; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Utah regret to lose the services of such an able jurist and humble, friendly soul, but rejoice in the great honor which has come to Justice Latimer and to the State of Utah: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah in session assembled, That Justice George W. Latimer be congratulated upon his appointment as Justice of the United States Court of Military Appeals; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Justice George W. Latimer, and to the President of the United States, and the Senate of the United States of America, and Utah delegation in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to ratify and confirm act 2. of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1951, authorizing the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of \$6,000,000 for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads.

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to ratify and confirm act 265 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1951, authorizing the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of \$6,000,000 for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall, upon its approval, be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President and Vice President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 18th day of May A. D. 1951.

"OREN E. LONG,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a bill enabling the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu to issue bonds for the completion of, the improvements to, and the development of certain existing public parks and playgrounds and for the acquisition, construction and improvement of new public parks and playgrounds in the city and county of Honolulu

"Whereas additional public-park areas are needed in the city and county of Honolulu; and

"Whereas the public parks and playgrounds are necessary for the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the city and county of Honolulu: Now, therefore, be it

"Enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is requested, through the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to enact legislation which will enable the Territory of Hawaii, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any act of this Congress notwithstanding, to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of \$1,600,000 for the completion of, the improvements to, and the development of certain existing public parks and playgrounds and for the acquisition, construction, and improvement of new public parks and playgrounds in the city and county of Honolulu, and to that end the Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested and urged, through said Delegate to Congress, to adopt a bill in substantially the following form, to wit:

"A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue bonds in the sum of \$1,600,000 for the completion of, the improvements to, and the development of certain existing public parks and playgrounds, and for the acquisition, construction and improvement of new public parks and playgrounds in the city and county of Honolulu

"Be it enacted, etc.—

"SECTION 1. The bonds issued under authority of this act may be either term or serial bonds, maturing, in the case of term bonds, not later than 30 years from the date of issue thereof, and, in the case of serial bonds, payable in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years and the last installment to mature not less than 30 years from the date of such issue. Such bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Act 255 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, pertaining to the issuance of bonds for the completion of, the improvements to, and the development of certain existing public parks and playgrounds, and for the acquisition of new public parks and playgrounds in the city and county of Honolulu, as authorized by this act, is hereby ratified and confirmed subject to the provisions of this act: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prohibit the amendment of such Territorial legislation by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii from time to time to provide for changes in the completions, improvements, development, acquisitions, and constructions authorized by such legislation and for the disposition of unexpended moneys realized from the sale of said bonds."

"SEC. 2. A copy of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the

United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior in Washington, D. C., to the Governor of Hawaii, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 5th day of June A. D. 1951.

"CREN E. LONG,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 38

"Joint resolution relative to the reopening of Birmingham General Hospital

"Whereas many of the residents of the city of Los Angeles and surrounding cities and communities have been inducted into the Armed Forces and the personnel of the Fortieth Division, a California National Guard unit recently federalized, was recruited from the same area, and casualties from the Korean campaign are now reaching the mainland in increasing numbers; and

"Whereas there is a critical and desperate need in and around the city of Los Angeles for medical facilities available to servicemen and their families, and the closest available facilities are now at Fort MacArthur and Camp Pendleton; and

"Whereas from the standpoint of practical economy it is logical that Birmingham General Hospital can be reopened at a minimum cost to the Government, when compared with the cost and time required to provide new buildings; and

"Whereas recent surveys by Federal and local authorities indicate an estimated life for the buildings at Birmingham General Hospital of from 10 to 25 years and the site of Birmingham General Hospital at Van Nuys, Calif., was selected by the Army on account of its agreeable climate, accessibility to rail facilities and centers of supplies, and the surrounding comprehensive highway system; and

"Whereas the same favorable conditions still exist and have been enhanced in recent years by developments such as the enlargement of the Van Nuys Airport to accommodate airplanes of the Constellation type; and

"Whereas the growth of the area surrounding Birmingham General Hospital will afford adequate housing and transportation for the members of the staff of the hospital, if it is reopened, as well as for the families of patients wishing to reside near the hospital: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Secretary of Defense to reopen the facility known as Birmingham General Hospital at Van Nuys, Calif., in order to provide adequate and convenient hospitalization to servicemen and their families in southern California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Defense, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Canby, Oreg., protesting against Federal taxation of municipal activities; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Queensboro Federation of Mothers' Clubs, Inc., of New York, N. Y., relating to the illegal importation of narcotics; to the Committee on Finance.

Two acts of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to authorizing the Board of Supervisors of the City of Honolulu to issue bonds for completion of certain public parks, and for the construction of the

Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEFENSE MOBILIZATION ACT OF 1950— RESOLUTION OF VIEW FARMERS UNION LOCAL, RURAL RAY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the View Farmers Union Local, of Rural Ray, N. Dak., favoring the reenactment of the Defense Mobilization Act of 1950.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the members of View Farmers Union Local, of Rural Ray, N. Dak., in regular meeting assembled this 28th day of May 1951, hereby adopt the following resolutions:

(a) That the Defense Mobilization Act of 1950 be reenacted.

(b) That no farm prices be frozen at any level below parity.

(c) That a good effective across-the-board price-control program is necessary and desirable.

Also, be it resolved that a copy of this resolution be mailed to each of our representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Mrs. SIMON PEPPER,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

NEWTON WAGNER.

J. A. HUKEL.

AID TO ISRAELI GOVERNMENT—RESOLU- TIONS OF LEGISLATURE OF MASSA- CHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relating to bills in the Congress to provide aid to the Israeli Government. I am happy to say that my colleague and myself are both in full support of the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government

Whereas there are now pending before Congress bills to grant aid to the Israeli Government, being S. 1247, H. R. 3458, H. R. 3488, and H. R. 3807; and

Whereas it is the purpose of these bills to give financial aid in the form of grants to the Government of the ancient and traditional democracy now known as the State of Israel; and

Whereas such assistance to the people of Israel in developing their natural resources, expanding their agricultural and industrial economy will mean a great productive capacity and will further the promotion of the security and general welfare of the United States and of Israel and will strengthen the ties of friendship between the people of the United States and of Israel; and

Whereas such grants would further the basic objectives of the Charter of the United Nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby respectfully requested by the General Court of Massachusetts to give intensive study and consideration to S. 1247, H. R. 3458, H. R. 3488, and H. R. 3807, now

pending in the Congress of the United States, and to use their best efforts to have this proposed legislation enacted into law; and be it further

Resolved, That the State secretary transmit forthwith duly certified copies of these resolutions to the presiding officer of the Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from Massachusetts in said Congress.

In senate, adopted, June 7, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,

Clerk.

In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, June 11, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,

Clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT—RESOLU- TION OF CITY COUNCIL OF ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of St. Paul, Minn., on June 7, 1951, in connection with the Defense Production Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States, certain bills designated as H. R. 3871 and S. 1397, introduced in the House of Representatives and the Senate respectively, the effect of which bills would give to the Office of Price Stabilization power to control rates of municipally owned utilities; and

Whereas it has historically been the policy of Congress not to interfere in the supervision, regulation or control of municipal utilities and the rates charged by such municipal utilities; and

Whereas municipal utilities are not operated for profit but actually are operated and maintained for the purpose of improving service to the public; and

Whereas municipal utilities are under direct and effective control of the municipality in which they operate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of St. Paul does hereby oppose the adoption of Senate bill S. 1397 and House bill designated as H. R. 3871; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Senator from Minnesota, Hon. EDWARD J. THYE, Senator from Minnesota, and to the Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Congressman from the district, with the request that they oppose the adoption of the aforesaid measures.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950— RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted by the executive council of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor at its quarterly meeting on June 2, in connection with the Defense Production Act of 1950.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas inflation is a great menace to American working people directly and to their efforts to make America strong against communism; and

Whereas the Government seeks to prevent further inflation by a system of orderly controls, both direct and indirect, on the American economy while it preserves maximum freedom for American citizens; and

Whereas some special interests would jeopardize America's defense and its economy by using only indirect controls; and

Whereas those indirect controls would lower the standard of living of American working people by taxing away their wages, restricting their credit, and forcing savings from inadequate wages in some cases and still not effectively prevent inflation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor executive council, in regular meeting Saturday, June 1, 1951, goes on record urging Congress to continue direct controls on prices and to strengthen the national Defense Production Act of 1950 as recommended by the President to the end that inflation may be effectively controlled and America made strong while it preserves as high a living standard as possible in a defense economy; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this declaration be sent to the President, all Minnesota Senators and Congressmen, and Mr. Michael V. DiSalle, Director of Price Stabilization.

PLACING OF RATES OF MUNICIPALLY OWNED PUBLIC UTILITIES UNDER OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION—RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted on June 8, 1951, by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., disapproving action by Congress to place rates of municipally owned public utilities under the jurisdiction of the Office of Price Stabilization.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution disapproving any attempt by Congress to place rates of municipally owned public utilities under the jurisdiction of the Office of Price Stabilization

Whereas it has been called to the attention of the city council that an effort is being made in Congress to require the consent and approval of the Office of Price Stabilization of any municipally owned utility rate change or fare change; and

Whereas specifically this is being attempted by H. R. 3871 and S. 1397; and

Whereas under the proposed amendments all privately owned utilities must give notice to the Office of Price Stabilization of the filing of an application for any increase in rate, fare, or charge and consent to the timely intervention of the Office of Price Stabilization before Federal, State, municipal or other public regulatory body; and

Whereas municipally owned utility fares, rates and charges for sewer and water works and for other municipally owned utilities should not be subject to control or approval by a Federal agency for the following reasons:

1. Such rates, fares, and charges are already under direct public control, that is, by the people themselves who own the municipal utility.

If such rates are excessive or inflationary, it is historically true that the segment of the American public which owns such utility will do something about it by removing the public officials in power or by reorganizing or refinancing the municipal utility.

2. There is no profit motive in the operation of municipal utilities. One of the very purposes of public ownership is to eliminate excessive profit from the operation of the utility so that the public may benefit therefrom in various ways through lower rates, better improvements through improved ability to finance, and so forth.

3. Municipal utility rates, fares and charges are almost universally below comparable privately owned utility fares, rates, and charges. Therefore, there is less need to regulate publicly owned utility fares, rates, and charges than privately owned utility fares, rates, and charges.

4. It has always been the intent of Congress to exempt from Federal control the regulation of municipal utilities in any shape, manner or form, and to exempt from Federal control the rates charged by municipally owned utilities. If that intent in the past has existed, and if municipally owned utilities are now effectively regulated as to their charges, rates, and fares by the public which owns them, it would seem wholly unnecessary if not improper, for Congress now to attempt to completely regulate all municipal utility rates, fares and charges by requiring approval first by the Office of Price Stabilization, and permitting all privately owned utilities to change their rates, fares, and charges, but only after a 30 days' notice to the Office of Price Stabilization to afford it an opportunity to be heard before the State, Federal, or municipal regulatory body.

5. To require approval by the Office of Price Stabilization before any change in municipal utility rates, charges, or fares would, in effect, be discriminating against municipally owned utilities by requiring more rigid control with municipally owned utilities and lesser control with reference to privately owned utilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That it oppose any attempt by Congress, either by H. R. 3871 or S. 1397, or otherwise, to exercise any control over rates and charges fixed by the city of Minneapolis for service by any publicly owned utility to its customers; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the Honorable Alben Barkley, Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Passed June 8, 1951.

C. L. SWANSON,
President of the Council.

Approved June 8, 1951.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:

ARLENE R. FINKLE,
Assistant City Clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RENT CONTROL—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE, HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by

the Hennepin County (Minn.) Board of Public Welfare at its regular meeting on June 1, 1951, relating to rent control.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE,

Minneapolis, Minn., June 5, 1951.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The board of public welfare at its regular meeting held June 1, 1951, adopted the following resolution:

"That the board go on record as favoring an extension of rent control, plus the following changes needed in the present law, and which are necessary to make it effective:

"1. Under the present law, if a landlord evicts a tenant wrongfully, such as demanding the premises for his own use and then not moving in himself, there is no remedy for the tenant. The Supreme Court has recently ruled that although the tenant has been wronged there is no law that allows the tenant to correct this injustice.

"2. Many units are not under rent control at the present time, such as rooming houses, hotels, and new construction. These units should be under rent control, at least for the purpose of protecting the tenant against arbitrary eviction.

"3. The Rent Advisory Board provided by the act is one of the most democratic standards that the tenant has against arbitrary action on the part of administrators. Our experience with the Minneapolis Rent Advisory Board is that these citizens put in long hours without any compensation whatsoever. If we expect due representation on these boards there should be a per diem payment for the time spent.

"4. Under the present law there is no criminal provision for willful violation of the rent law. This omission weakens the hand of the Administrator in enforcing the act."

Very truly yours,

O. A. PEARSON, Secretary.

PRICE CONTROLS—RESOLUTIONS OF HOLSTEIN-FRIESIAN ASSOCIATION, WEST ALLIS, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have this morning received from Florence Reynolds, secretary of the Holstein-Friesian Association of Wisconsin, West Allis, Wis., resolutions on behalf of certain fiscal policies to curb the inflationary price rise and in opposition to the price roll-back on beef. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No. 1

Whereas inflation and devalued dollars, constitute a serious threat to the economy to the United States of America and will lead us inevitably along the road toward economic chaos and destruction; and

Whereas amendments to the Defense Production Act, now introduced in the Congress of the United States, appear to us to contribute further to these dangers: Be it

Resolved by the annual convention of the Holstein-Friesian Association of America, meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, this 6th day of June 1951, and representing over 41,000 members, That it go on record as strongly recommending and urging restrictions on the expansion of the money supply, strict

economy by Government, pay-as-we-go taxation, limitations on consumer credit, encouragement of individual savings, and increased production, by the removal of controls that limit output and prevent full use of resources.

No. 2

Be it resolved by the annual convention of the Holstein-Friesian Association of America, meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, this 6th day of June 1951, and representing over 41,000 members, That it go on record as opposing the price roll-back on beef, as ordered by the Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, for the reason, that such order discriminates against and adversely affects the interest of dairy farmers the country over, as dairy farmers supply 42 percent of the total quantity of the beef and veal consumed in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Office of Price Stabilization with copies to the public press.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1645. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American University; without amendment (Rept. No. 421);

S. 657. A bill to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 422);

S. 1152. A bill to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 423);

S. 1167. A bill to require a premarital examination of all applicants for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 424); and

S. 1349. A bill to establish a Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 425).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 258. A bill to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 439);

S. 493. A bill to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 440);

S. 951. A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles; with an amendment (Rept. No. 441); and

S. 1590. A bill to extend and revise the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 442).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1726. A bill to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 426).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 818. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ellsworth Schroeder; with amendments (Rept. No. 427);

S. 1033. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lucille Ellen Sanders Groh; with amendments (Rept. No. 428);

S. 1034. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Julia Jackson Sanders; with amendments (Rept. No. 429);

S. 1036. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Julia Jackson Sanders; with amendments (Rept. No. 430);

H. R. 630. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Richard James Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 431);

H. R. 631. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Alice E. Williams Sisk; without amendment (Rept. No. 432);

H. R. 964. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Percival H. Glenn; without amendment (Rept. No. 433);

H. R. 2349. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 434);

H. R. 3033. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain land in the State of Montana to the city of Poplar and the county of Roosevelt, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 435);

H. R. 3215. A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Crow Reservation, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 436); and

H. R. 3216. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lulu M. Whitebear; without amendment (Rept. No. 437).

SMALL-BUSINESS MANPOWER PROBLEMS—REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (REPT. NO. 438)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a report on small-business manpower problems, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, without objection, printed as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McMAHON (by request):

S. 1690. A bill for the relief of Cleve W. Steeves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1691. A bill for the relief of Betty Rubak MacDonald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1692. A bill for the relief of Hilde Schindler and her minor daughter, Edeline Schindler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1693. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of Colorado, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. LONG, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. FERGUSON):

S. 1694. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. HUNT, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1695. A bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to make the restrictions of the Federal Reserve Act on holding office in a member bank inapplicable to M. S. Szymczak when he ceases to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF PENALTY PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO PERSONS CONVICTED OF VIOLATING CERTAIN NARCOTIC LAWS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1695) to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

The bill which I have filed to provide for mandatory minimum penalties for violating certain narcotic laws is filed by direction of Senator O'CONOR, chairman of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime. All of the members of said committee join as cosponsors, to wit: Senators O'CONOR, HUNT, TOBEY, and WILEY.

The hearings held some time back by the Special Crime Investigating Committee showed positive need for minimum mandatory punishing for narcotic violators. This was one of the principal recommendations of Commissioner Anslinger, of the Bureau of Narcotics. The Special Crime Investigating Committee stated many months ago that it urged the passage of this legislation and this was one of the legislative recommendations in the Third Interim Report submitted to the Senate on May 1, 1951.

The bill provides for a minimum sentence of 2 to 5 years for the first offense, 5 to 10 years for the second offense, and from 10 to 20 years for the third offense. Upon conviction for a second or subsequent offense, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation shall not be granted.

Continuing investigations and new inquiries have developed additional evidence of the necessity of this legislation. Fortunately the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has favorably acted upon this legislation and has recommended the passage of a bill, H. R. 3490, which is now pending for action before the House, and which was filed by that most able Congressman, HALE BOGGS of Louisiana.

The legislation is so urgently necessary that this bill is filed now so that the Finance Committee of the Senate can have the bill before it for consideration during the time H. R. 3490 is awaiting action in the House of Representatives.

I shall not recite details as to the necessity for this legislation. It is suffice to say that Commissioner Anslinger and his associates of the Narcotics Bureau feel that this is the most positive step that can be taken to stop the vicious narcotics trade and peddling in the Nation. The penalties in the bill are those recommended by Mr. Anslinger. I think the committee should consider making them more severe. In any event, this bill can be the basis for consideration.

M. S. SZYMCAK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which has the approval of the Banking and Currency Committee, having to do with the resignation from the Federal Reserve Board of Mr. M. S. Szymczak. Mr. Szymczak has been a member of the Federal Reserve Board for 18 years and has rendered conspicuous service. It is his intention, I understand, if this joint resolution is passed, to resign from the Board and accept office in a member bank. He described his plans before both the House and the Senate committees. I fear we are going to lose a noble public servant who has rendered outstanding service throughout many years. I know our good wishes go with him when he retires from the Federal Reserve Board.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to make the restrictions of the Federal Reserve Act on holding office in a member bank inapplicable to M. S. Szymczak when he ceases to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WELKER) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted 16 amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3880, supra, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3880, supra, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND (S. DOC. NO. 44)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the eleventh annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, together with the letter of transmittal, be printed as a Senate document with an illustration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator

from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

Address on the broader aspects of American agriculture, delivered by him before the sixth annual convention of the American Plant Food Council, at Hot Springs, Va., on June 15, 1951.

By Mr. WILEY:

An article prepared by him, entitled "The Wisconsin River: A Private Development in the Public Interest."

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Editorial dealing with the question of controls, entitled "The Lesser Peril," published in the June 14, 1951, issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

Editorial dealing with the record of Gen. George C. Marshall, entitled "The Marshall Record," published in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

By Mr. LANGER:

Editorial dealing with the prosecution of certain Communist leaders, entitled "Six Men Amend the Constitution," published in the June 5, 1951, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Article relating to the foreign policy of the United States, entitled "For What We Have Achieved," published in the London Economist of June 9, 1951.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF DELEGATES TO UNESCO

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session I ask unanimous consent that I may report, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, several nominations of delegates of the United States to the United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization, known as UNESCO. The committee has unanimously ordered the reporting of the nominations. There are a number of nominations. The delegates are in Paris attending a meeting of the organization, and they are suffering the embarrassment of not having had their nominations confirmed by the Senate. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations may be confirmed en bloc at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator from Texas if the nominations were unanimously approved by the committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. They were; yes. The reason they were not placed on the executive calendar is that the meeting of the organization opens today in Paris. We do not wish to embarrass them by not having their nominations as delegates from the United States confirmed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Are the delegates in Paris now?

Mr. CONNALLY. They are there now. That is what I have been informed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator advise the Senate when the nominations were sent to the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. They were sent to the Senate on May 29, but the Committee on Foreign Relations has been tied up, as the Senator knows, with the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate what the Senator is saying. I do not know how he could have held a meeting of his committee in the meantime.

Mr. CONNALLY. The joint hearing of the two committees adjourned today, and the Committee on Foreign Relations was able to hold a hearing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator from Texas read the names of the nominees?

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say that the nominations were referred to the Senators from the States involved. The names are:

George F. Zook, of Virginia. He was formerly the head of the Department of Education in Washington.

Mrs. Helen C. Russell, of California.

Elvin C. Stakman, of Minnesota.

Howland H. Sargeant, of Rhode Island.

George D. Stoddard, of Illinois.

I may say that these are not salaried positions. The delegates are paid a per diem during the sessions, and expenses.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding from the Senator from Texas that the nominations bear the unanimous recommendation of the committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not like on such short notice to take action on matters which affect our international relations. Apparently we are up against the gun and we must take the word of the Committee on Foreign Relations. They are just names as they have been read off to the Senate. They may be good and they may be bad.

Mr. CONNALLY. They were all referred to the Senators from the States involved. No objection was filed against any of the nominees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas that the nominations be considered at this time? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Paul W. Brosman, of Louisiana, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals;

George W. Latimer, of Utah, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals; and

Robert Emmett Quinn, of Rhode Island, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Irving Florman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Bolivia;

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and

Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Cuba;

John C. Wiley, of Indiana, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Panama;

William G. Allen, of Vermont, and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers in the diplomatic service;

Ware Adams, of Georgia, and sundry other Foreign Service officers, for promotion from class 2 to class 1; and

Heyward G. Hill, of Louisiana, and sundry other persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3380) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business before the Senate is House bill 3380, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not know what is the pleasure of the majority leader, but I feel that inasmuch as we have now reached the point where the bill is open to further amendment, a quorum call should be had.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will leave that honor to the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments have all been agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean that since all committee amendments have been adopted, and since the bill is now open to further amendment, we should have a quorum call. For that reason, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McKellar
Anderson	Hayden	McMahon
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hennings	Moody
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoy	Nixon
Byrd	Holland	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Connally	Kefauver	Smathers
Cordon	Kem	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	Lehman	Taft
Eaton	Long	Thye
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Weiker
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
Frear	McCarran	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams
George	McFarland	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr.

O'CONNOR], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. The amendment is designated "6-15-51-A."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "\$315,600" and insert "\$290,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this amendment is proposed on page 3, line 12. The item in the bill reads as follows:

EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

For the care, maintenance, repair, and alteration, furnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the Executive Mansion grounds, and traveling expenses, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, \$315,600.

Mr. President, the \$315,600 appropriation contained in the bill is an increase of \$49,600 over the appropriation for the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. From what page of the bill is the Senator reading?

Mr. FERGUSON. Page 3.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not insist on the amendment. The Commission involved here, like the rest of us, has run into the problem of inflation. I believe they have been exceedingly careful. That is all I know about it. All that I have heard about it is to the effect that they have been exceedingly careful. Certainly this does not represent an extravagant amount. I hope the Senator will not insist on his amendment. I have great respect for the Senator from Michigan, as he knows. I feel that I should state the facts in-

involved in this subject. The Commission is trying to do a good job.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Tennessee says, but I must advise him that the item to which he has made reference is not the item about which the amendment of the Senator from Michigan applies. The item of the salaries for the members of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion is not included in the paragraph on page 3. The item to which the Senator from Tennessee refers is on page 12, line 20. It is a \$25,000 item. The Senator from Michigan does not intend to propose any cut in that item at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to say that when that item is reached I wish to add to what I have said. I shall have to make a telephone call before I can give the exact amount involved.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the Senator's interest in the item, because the Senator from Tennessee is a member of the Commission, and it is a Commission item, rather than one referring to the Executive Mansion and the grounds.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in 1951 the appropriation for the Executive Mansion and grounds was \$266,000. For 1952 the request is \$315,600. The House allowed \$315,600. The appropriation in the bill is \$315,600. The amount proposed in my amendment is \$290,000, which represents a reduction of \$25,000, but is still higher than the 1951 appropriation.

This is not an item which is touched by the reduction-of-salaries item, since it has been exempted in the committee. The White House is not covered by the proposed cut in the personnel item. For personal services the request is \$228,965, as against \$204,405 last year and \$175,878 the previous year. The average number of employees has increased from 58 in 1950 to 66 at the present time. For the fiscal year 1952 the number of employees is 75.

The increase of \$49,600 over last year's appropriation is to cover additional operating expenses required by the expanded facilities of the White House and grounds for a period of 7 months after completion of the White House renovation on December 1. It is at the rate of an annual increase of \$80,000.

To justify the increase, it has been submitted that roughly 30 percent additional floor area and facilities must be maintained. But the curious thing is that the dollar request also is a 30 percent increase. In other words, the increase is by rule of thumb rather than on the basis of any calculated relationship to additional requirement. I cannot subscribe to the view that costs of maintenance go up in exact proportion to the area of floor space or facilities to be maintained.

The amendment proposes a reduction of \$25,000 in this appropriation item, which will permit an increase in operating expense at an annual rate of \$42,850, instead of \$80,000.

As specific suggestions for reductions from budget estimates attention is di-

rected to the question of actual need of 10 additional employees for operation of the new air conditioning system in the White House, to such materials as paint and lumber, which would seem unnecessary in a renovated establishment, and to what appears to be an unusually expensive contract for servicing the building's elevators, most of which are new. We will have a new White House on the 1st of January, and yet we find that to maintain it, keep it in repair, and service the building we are asked to increase the appropriation by \$80,000. Everyone who is familiar with new buildings knows that the upkeep for the first few years is not large. All the decoration is new. Everything is new. The building will be practically new. Only the outside walls remain from the old building. We are not asking for a cut in the amount of the payroll at the White House. We are seeking to cut down the amount for servicing the new building.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am sorry that there are so few Senators on the floor. I wish the RECORD to show that after lengthy hearings the House approved \$315,600 for the upkeep of the Executive Mansion and grounds. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan would reduce the House figure. When I noticed the increase, I sent for Mr. Crim, of the White House.

Mr. Crim said:

Mr. CRIM. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The renovated mansion will provide approximately 30 percent additional space, and the building for the first time in history will be completely air-conditioned. * * * It is estimated that the increase in cost of electric power alone will amount to approximately \$25,000 per annum.

The amount is determined by the power company and the White House officials.

An increase of \$49,600 is requested to cover the additional operating expenses required by the expanded facilities.

I shall not read the remainder of his statement, because I know a great many amendments will be offered to the bill. The subcommittee took the figures of the House after hearing testimony on the subject. We had Mr. Crim appear before us, and we were told that the increase in the space was 30 percent. It is now a six-story building, whereas formerly it was only a four-story building. It has been completely air-conditioned. That is all I have to say about it, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. Those of us who are interested in the amendment appreciate that there is virtually a rule that the committee does not challenge proposed White House expenditures. That is ordinarily the rule. However, the sponsors of the amendment do not believe that the mere addition of floor space in the White House, to the extent of a 30-percent increase in the floor space available in the new building, should increase by 30 percent the expense of maintaining the building during the coming fiscal year.

We appreciate that the President has indicated that this budget is what he terms a tight budget, and that he says that not one dollar can be cut from it.

That is the statement which has been given to the press and to the public.

Mr. MAYBANK. Who does the Senator from Michigan say is the one who said the budget could not be cut?

Mr. FERGUSON. The President.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall not enter into a debate as to what the President said in that connection, but the bill as reported to the Senate by the committee provides appropriations which are less by more than \$600,000,000 than the appropriations called for in the estimates.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. However, the White House is being enlarged by the addition of two more floors, and the result will be to increase the floor space in the building by 30 percent. In addition, the rates for electric power have increased, and the building has been air-conditioned.

Mr. FERGUSON. We do not question those things at all. However, the Chief Executive said the budget could not be cut and that it would be absolutely necessary for the Congress to appropriate the amounts of the budget requests.

So the question before the Congress today is whether some cuts can be made in the budget. Those of us who sponsor this amendment feel that a cut can be made in this item, inasmuch as it relates to a new building which certainly should require less maintenance than the old building did. The mere fact that there will be a 30-percent increase in the floor space does not mean that during the first year of maintaining the new building a 30-percent increase will be required in the appropriations previously made for maintaining a building which was more than 100 years old.

The reason assigned for the expenditure of the \$5,000,000 for the Executive Mansion was that the building was old and obsolete and was about to fall down and required many repairs. Now the Mansion has been completely rebuilt; but, nevertheless, we find that the request for funds for the maintenance of the new building exceeds in amount the request for funds for the maintenance of the building before it was rebuilt. Certainly the Senate should make a cut at this particular time in this item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the amendment, which has been submitted by the Senator from Michigan, on behalf of himself, the Senator from Nebraska, and myself, is a very simple one. The Congress is spending millions of dollars to rebuild the Executive Mansion or the White House. As the Senator from South Carolina has said, it is true that the Mansion, when rebuilt, will have 30 percent more floor space; but, in my opinion, that is no argument for increased appropriations for maintenance. The rebuilt White House will be a finer Executive Mansion. It should be cleaner, more modern, easier to care for, and more efficient in operation. Less labor should be required for its maintenance.

In fact, instead of calling for increased maintenance, less maintenance should be required and requested.

This item has nothing to do with the personnel employed by the President. There has been some discussion in regard to that matter; but I feel that if the President justifies his request for personnel, the legislative branch of the Government should not interfere in that case.

However, the item to which this amendment relates provides funds for the maintenance of the Executive Mansion and its grounds. Even though the White House when rebuilt will have an increased amount of floor space, nevertheless the reconstructed building should be more efficient and modern in every respect and should be easier to maintain. Therefore, why should the personnel assigned to care for the rebuilt White House be increased?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Has it always been true that the appropriation made under this heading is turned over to the Chief Executive, to be spent at his discretion? I ask that question because I note in the item the words "and traveling expenses."

Mr. BRIDGES. It is my understanding that this item is similar to corresponding items in previous appropriation bills. However, I would have to check as to that matter, because I do not have the previous appropriations before me at this time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is there any budget for the maintenance and upkeep of the White House and its grounds?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Bureau of the Budget, as the Senator from Maryland knows, is a creature of the Chief Executive; the Bureau of the Budget really represents the President. Therefore, any recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget in regard to the White House would really have no effect or no meaning, because the Bureau of the Budget naturally is not going to change or alter the figures submitted by its boss, the President.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to know why maintenance funds for the White House and its grounds are lumped with travel expenses for the Chief Executive. Is there any breakdown to show the details?

Mr. BRIDGES. This item, as I understand it, has nothing to do with travel expenses for the President.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I notice in line 10 on page 3 the words "and traveling expenses." For whom are those traveling expenses to be allowed?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall read the entire item appearing on page 3, beginning in line 6:

EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refurbishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the Executive Mansion grounds, and traveling expenses, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, \$315,600.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. For whom are the traveling expenses to be allowed?

Mr. BRIDGES. I assume that they are traveling expenses for some of the personnel assigned to the grounds and to the care of the White House. I do not understand that the traveling expenses referred to relate to travel by the President himself.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Why should those matters be left to the discretion of the President? Is not there some budget for this item?

Mr. BRIDGES. As I have said to the Senator, the Bureau of the Budget is a creature of the President, and therefore a budget for this item would be rather meaningless, inasmuch as it would be a recommendation made by a subordinate to the Chief Executive.

In short, this item is more or less a carte blanche item for the President, but it is the Chief Executive who directs the operation and maintenance of the Executive Mansion and its grounds. I do not know to whom else this fund might be assigned. I am informed that in previous years this item has been handled in the same manner.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is there a breakdown as to how these funds will be spent, based on experience in previous years?

Mr. BRIDGES. My understanding is that in the 1951 appropriation bill this item was \$266,000. The request for the 1952 appropriation bill was \$315,600. The House voted to appropriate that amount. The amount carried in the bill now before the Senate is the same as the amount voted by the House of Representatives. Our amendment would reduce that amount by \$25,600, to \$290,000, which would still leave this item approximately \$24,000 more than was appropriated for this purpose last year. We believe that would be reasonable.

There is no breakdown in regard to the details of the item, as submitted to us. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that I do not like the idea of legislating in this way, but this item is for the executive branch of the Government, and the Congress has never scrutinized such expenditures as completely and as fully as perhaps it should. I think perhaps the Congress is at fault for not doing so; but because this item relates to the Executive, we have provided for it in that manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is requested.

Mr. McMAHON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Butler, Md.	Case
Anderson	Butler, Nebr.	Chavez
Bennett	Byrd	Clements
Bricker	Capehart	Connally
Bridges	Carlson	Cordon

Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Nixon
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kefauver	Pastore
Eaton	Kem	Robertson
Ellender	Kilgore	Russell
Ferguson	Knowland	Saltonstall
Flanders	Langer	Schoepfel
Frear	Lehman	Smathers
Fulbright	Long	Smith, Maine
George	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Green	Malone	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	Maybank	Sparkman
Hendrickson	McCarran	Taft
Hennings	McClellan	Thye
Hickenlooper	McFarland	Watkins
Hill	McKellar	Welker
Hoyer	McMahon	Wherry
Holland	Millikin	Wiley
Humphrey	Moody	Williams
Jenner	Mundt	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pastore in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] whether there was any suggestion in the committee that this cut be made, or is this the first notice the Senator has had of it?

Mr. MAYBANK. This is the first time I have heard of it. I do not recall any motions being submitted.

Mr. McMAHON. Was there any suggestion in the committee that such a cut be made?

Mr. MAYBANK. Not that I remember.

Mr. McMAHON. I have read the record hastily and I do not find that any motion was made or that any comment was made in the meeting of the committee with reference to this proposed cut. Is it correct that the number of rooms in the White House will be increased from 82 to more than over 100?

Mr. MAYBANK. I can only say that I was told there would be an over-all increase of 30 percent in the space, plus additional cost for power, air conditioning, and so forth.

Mr. McMAHON. There will be 128 rooms, and there used to be 82 rooms.

Mr. MAYBANK. That would be about correct. If we increased the appropriation one-third it would be raised considerably more than the amount provided by the bill. We took the House figures. The increase amounts to \$49,600 over last year's appropriation.

Mr. McMAHON. That would cover the expanding facilities.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct; and it would also cover the increased cost of electricity. Power rates have increased.

I think it will be found in the consideration of all the appropriation bills that the rates for electricity have been raised during the past year.

Mr. McMAHON. I have looked over the hearings and do not find any suggestion of a reduction or any contrary vote to the appropriation now provided by the bill. Is it not the regular procedure of the committee, if someone does not like an appropriation, that testimony is produced in connection with the question? What good to us are hearings if on an item on which there was no testimony before the committee

an effort is made to get a headline on a proposal involving \$25,000?

Mr. MAYBANK. I cannot answer the Senator's question. It is customary for the committee to make a record, and a record was made. Before the committee no one objected to the \$315,000 for the upkeep of the Executive Mansion and grounds. No one in the committee questioned it.

Mr. McMAHON. The point I make is that when we are confronted with a record I should like to see some testimony in the record that will support the proposed cut. If it were there, I might be glad to vote for it.

Mr. MAYBANK. If there had been any testimony to indicate that some cut should be made, I believe the Senator from Connecticut knows me sufficiently well to be sure I would have stated it.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who says he notices in the record of the Appropriations Committee hearings no motion with reference to a cut in this item, that the mark-up of the bill, as the distinguished Senator knows, is done in executive session, and it is not a part of the hearings. There was no case made for the decrease; neither was much of a case made for the increase.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, when we noticed an increase over last year we called Government officials to come before the committee, and they explained that there was a 30-percent increase in space, and that a great many things had gone up in price.

Mr. BRIDGES. My thought was that, like the Senator from Connecticut, I wanted to be very fair in this matter.

The Government has spent several million dollars to rebuild the White House, and we were told that when it was rebuilt we would have a new building that would be clean, efficient, labor-saving, and more economical, as well as providing more conveniences and safety for the President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I stood before the committee, and on this floor, and opposed a new White House building, because I thought the White House was one of the most beautiful buildings in the world. I still think so. I think it has been well renovated, and I believe the country will be proud of it when the work is finished.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not mean to say that the entire building is new. The shell was left, of course.

The point I wanted to make to the Senator from Connecticut, who I know wants to be fair in this matter, was that the 1951 appropriation was \$266,000. The proposed cut would still leave \$24,000 more than the last regular appropriation, which will take care of any increase in the cost of electricity, or any other normal increase.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Is it not true that the President is at Blair House instead of at the White House?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct, but he still uses the White House offices and grounds. The appropriation covers the offices in the White House and the grounds. What we did was to try to arrive at a reasonable figure. If it does not work out, we can correct it another year, if this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that Blair House is under the jurisdiction of the State Department rather than of the White House?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CASE. That being true, I invite attention to the testimony of Mr. Crim, who was asked the following question by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]:

And you got in this past year \$266,000 that it has cost you to operate the grounds and Executive Office and the Blair House. Is that not right?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Blair House is temporarily under the jurisdiction of the White House. Ordinarily, it comes under the jurisdiction of the State Department.

Mr. CASE. The question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts was as follows:

Senator SALTONSTALL. And you got, in the past year, \$266,000 that it has cost you to operate the grounds and the Executive Office and the Blair House. Is that not right?

Mr. CRIM. Yes.

Then the Senator from Massachusetts made the suggestion that the additional \$49,600 be left out, and he did it in this way:

Why would it not be a wise thing for this committee just to leave out the additional \$49,600 with the general thought that when you get an accurate estimate along about next January, you can come back and ask for it in a supplemental?

It is apparent, by reference to the record, that the increased amount contemplates only a 7-month operation of the new White House, and if I read the record correctly over the week end, the White House will not be ready when it was expected it would be ready.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is understood that it will be ready December 1, and, as the Senator said, a period of 7 months would be covered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to inquire how much the amount of \$315,600 which is carried in the bill is under the budget request.

Mr. BRIDGES. The budget request was exactly that amount, as I understand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So, in the bill as reported by the committee there is no reduction below the budget request?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. None whatsoever?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. But as the Senator from Arkansas knows very well, the Bureau of the Budget is a creature of the executive; therefore, the Bureau of the Budget would not normally attempt to cut any recommendation made by the White House.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not talking about whether the Bureau of the Budget cut a recommendation made by the White House. I am asking whether the committee made such a cut.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it did not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. One other question. Would a general provision for a 5- or 10-percent reduction apply to this item?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan can answer that question. The answer is "No." It does not apply to the White House, or, as it is called, the Executive Mansion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, if we support the amount carried in the bill we are supporting the Budget Bureau estimate for the item.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator explain to me how the amendment would have the effect of reducing the ultimate cost of repairing and modernizing the White House? Regardless of what we do now, it will still cost the same amount to get the job done, will it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana has misinterpreted the purpose of the amendment. The amendment has nothing to do with construction. It has to do only with personnel and maintenance after the job is completed.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may we have the yeas and nays on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if it would be agreeable if I were to ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the quorum be rescinded and ask to modify the amendment so as to provide that the amount of the item shall be \$300,000? I should like to know whether the chairman of the subcommittee would accept such a modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that the order for a quorum call be rescinded? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would have no objection to accepting the amendment to make the amount contained in the item

\$300,000, and taking it to conference. I will be perfectly frank and say that I cannot state whether the House will sustain that figure. However, I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. Therefore, it would require unanimous consent—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment in the way I have just suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I was called out of the Chamber while the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] was speaking on this matter, and I should like to know from him what the situation is.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I would be inclined to go along with the chairman of the subcommittee and see what comes out of conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When it goes to conference and the conferees have acted, the opportunity will have passed to see what is going to be done.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish it distinctly understood that I do not wish to hold up the \$300,000. I think the Senator from Michigan understood that. I am not going to do that, but I will take it to conference if the Senate so directs. I wanted Senators to know where I stood.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has made his position quite clear.

Mr. President, the burden of the expense of government is to be found in the moneys which we appropriate for the national defense. The budget which is now before the Senate Appropriations Committee for the three defense departments amounts to \$60,650,000,000, and we still have not received the budget for certain public works. A request is to be made by the armed services for authorization for the construction of public works for the defense of the Nation. What the Congress decides with respect to the appropriations for national defense will determine to what extent taxes will have to be raised, and to what extent there will be a deficit, if any. We shall not avoid a deficit by curtailment in the appropriations for the Executive Mansion; by curtailment in the appropriations for the Interstate Commerce Commission; or by curtailment in the appropriations for various civil establishments. Wherever there are excessive appropriations, such curtailments ought to be made. But the Senate and the country should know that the appropriations for national defense, the appropriations for war-connected activities, amount to more than 84 percent of the entire expenditures of the Government.

The pending measure carries national defense appropriations for the President, for the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Maritime Administration. The total of these five appropriations amounts to \$1,645,950,500. Every penny

of that appropriation has a direct connection with our present national emergency.

The Atomic Energy Commission is making atomic weapons. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is carrying on essential research without which it will be impossible for this Nation to keep abreast of the aerial development of Soviet Russia. All but 2 percent of the appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority is needed to provide power for defense work. A substantial part of the appropriation for the Maritime Administration is designed to provide shipping which is necessary in the emergency.

In addition to these, the bill carries an appropriation for the American Battle Monuments Commission, for the Displaced Persons Commission, and for the Veterans' Administration, three separate services all of which are the result of past wars. The total of these three appropriations is \$3,980,655,220.

The net result, therefore, is that out of the total of \$6,221,959,620 carried in the bill for three separate agencies of Government, something more than \$5,625,000,000 is for expenditures connected with wars past and present, or 90 percent of the total.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to call the distinguished Senator's attention to the fact that in past years he was chairman of this subcommittee. He and I have been on the subcommittee together for many years, considering appropriations for the independent offices. There is an item of \$1,739,000,000 which is purely for national defense. It consists principally of the appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The appropriation for the Executive Mansion, which we are discussing, was \$266,000 last year. The request this year is for \$315,000. Mr. Crim, who testified, stated that the building would not be ready until December 1, and that this amount is a guess. It is the best guess he could make, but it is only a guess. It is not based upon any experience. I asked him at the hearing if he could not cut the request back, and come in later for a supplemental appropriation. He said he thought that was inadvisable. He thought the money should be made available now, and he gave some reasons.

I agree entirely with the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee in taking to conference an item of \$300,000 rather than \$315,000. At best it is a guess. It is not based upon experience. The building may not be completed by December 1.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am not going to object, but I am taking advantage of the opportunity to lay before the Senate a few plain facts. Nothing should be more clear to Members of the committee than what the Senator from Massachusetts has just stated. In explaining why this agreement should

be made, he tells us of his examination of the witness, and of his suggestion to the witness that he should come back later for a supplemental appropriation. We had a discussion of that question this morning in the subcommittee in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill. One of the members of the subcommittee said, "I cannot understand why we should undertake to cut appropriations, and then invite the departments to come back for deficiency appropriations." I remarked at that time that frequently when we make cuts on the floor of the Senate, in a situation in which there is a lack of information, we do so with the invitation to the various departments involved to come back later and ask for more money. It seems to me that that is not a logical procedure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree 100 percent with what the Senator from Wyoming says. However, in this instance there is a building which is not even completed. I hope it will be completed by December 1. Mr. Crim stated that the amount of the request was a guess. It was not based upon facts or experience. I agree that we should not make a cut with an invitation to the departments concerned to come back for a supplemental appropriation. However, in this instance the amount is a guess. It may be too high or it may be too low.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right. As I stated, I do not intend to object, but I thought this was as good a time as any to place in the Record certain facts which I have assembled with respect to the independent offices bill. A year ago, when, as the Senator from South Carolina has said, I was chairman of this subcommittee, I was impressed by the fact that by far the largest part of the money in the Independent Offices appropriation bill had to do with defense-connected expenditure of various kinds. This bill carries the entire appropriation for the support of the Veterans' Administration. How many people know that the cost of carrying out the obligations which by law we have imposed upon the Veterans' Administration, plus interest upon the national debt, together amount to more than \$11,000,000,000, which, in turn, is approximately equal to the entire appropriation for all the civil functions of the Government?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the Senator from Wyoming aware of the fact that the reduction in the amount of the bill this year is accounted for by a reduction in the Veterans' Administration appropriation, and also the fact that the appropriation for stockpiling of strategic materials was \$3,000,000,000 last year, and that it is not in the bill this year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not quite sure that I understand what the Senator is saying.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. What the Senator from Delaware mentions was done because of the action of the committee. I am glad we did it. In the Eightieth Congress we authorized contractual obligations to buy materials in the future. This appropriation represents the cash payment, as should have been the case during the past 4 years. We had to catch up with all the obligations which were made in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Whatever the facts may be with respect to this matter, they are altogether irrelevant to the point I am making, which is that when we add together the expenditures which we must make for the Veterans' Administration and the expenditures we must make to pay the interest on the national debt, we have a total which is practically equal to the expenditures for all the civil functions of the Government.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I was enjoying the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming. He says that if we want to balance the budget we must do something about the large expenditures, such as the expenditures for national defense. That is the point I wish to make. When we had before us for consideration the fourth supplemental appropriation bill I offered an amendment which would have made it possible to save a nickel out of every dollar. In that connection I was trying to make the very same point. The large appropriations which we are now making are for national defense. In addition, we have certain contractual obligations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At that time I urged that the Senator's amendment, which he offered on the floor of the Senate, to make a blanket cut in the fourth supplemental bill, be defeated. It was defeated. The reason I made the argument was that I believed that the cuts should be made upon information and evidence obtained by the committees having charge of the particular bills. Such reductions cannot be intelligently made without information and evidence. In the interest of economy, such reductions should not be made by amendments hastily offered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CASE. Of course, the distinguished Senator will recall that in that case the committee was reporting the budget estimate. No reduction was proposed. Furthermore, the amendment which was offered did not make a specific cut in specific items, but would have left it to the departments to make cuts wherever they wished to do so.

The point I wish to make is that the Senator from Wyoming has stated that if we are to balance the budget and save something on the tax bill we must scan the big money items, and they are the national defense items. It is important to make savings. We cannot answer to our responsibility to the country without doing whatever we can all along the line.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course the Senator is correct. I am all for doing it. But I should like to see it done in an orderly manner based upon information, after scrutiny of the various items,

All the items in the independent offices bill were examined by the committee. I know that many of the members of the committee were diligent in attendance at committee hearings. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] scarcely missed a session. I believe both Senators have been thoroughly informed as to the money items in the bill. When the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from South Carolina agree upon a matter such as this I do not intend to raise any objection. I wish to point out, however, that we must not perform an operation of false economy by the hasty adoption of amendments presented on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan to modify his amendment? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas-and-nays vote be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "B" referring to the Federal Trade Commission appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, line 2, it is proposed to strike the figure \$3,989,130 and substitute therefor the figure "\$4,392,000"; on page 16, line 2, it is proposed to strike the figure "\$3,625,800" and substitute therefor "\$4,028,655."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to increase the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission by approximately \$402,000, in order that it may enforce the amended section 7 of the Clayton Act, giving the Commission certain jurisdiction in connection with corporate mergers. The new section 7 was passed by Congress last year.

Mr. President, in regard to the history of the appropriation the Federal Trade Commission requested \$950,000 for the enforcement of section 7. The Bureau of the Budget approved and recommended to Congress \$500,000 for that purpose.

The House committee reduced the figure to \$365,000. The House, in adopting the Keating amendment, eliminated any increased funds whatever for the Commission. The Senate committee recommends \$250,000 for the purpose of enforcement of section 7.

However, with the adoption of the Ferguson amendment, the amount of the appropriation for this item is brought down to \$97,435.

Effective enforcement of section 7 is essential to the economy. It is essential for the protection of small businesses at a time when they are in greater need of protection than in any previous period in our history, at a time when they cannot even receive materials, supplies, and equipment in order to continue in business. The enforcement of section 7 is urgently necessary to protect the country from the monopolistic trends which have been so prevalent in the past few years.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I wish to invite attention to the fact that on December 13 of last year the Senate passed a bill amending section 7 of the Clayton Act. The vote was 53 to 22. The House of Representatives passed it by substantially the same 3 to 1 vote. The vote in the House was 223 in favor of amending the act and 92 in opposition. The Federal Trade Commission has had no funds and will have no funds in any appreciable amount with which to make the investigations necessary to determine whether cease and desist orders should be issued as required by the amended section 7.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator give the figures of the change he is proposing in this case?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The request is to increase the appropriation on page 16, in line 2, by \$402,000. That would give the Federal Trade Commission \$500,000 for the enforcement of section 7 of the Clayton Act. As a result of the various reductions proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan and other amendments, \$97,435 of increased funds will be available, as set forth on page 6 in the report on the bill. That amount is, of course, utterly inadequate for the purpose of enforcing section 7. Therefore, the purpose of this amendment is to increase the appropriation in order to bring it up to the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the enforcement of section 7.

The Federal Trade Commission felt that \$950,000 would be required for this purpose. The Bureau of the Budget cut this request in half, recommending \$500,000.

Mr. President, it would hardly be consistent with our action in passing section 7 of the Clayton Act if we were to deny the Federal Trade Commission, which is the enforcement agency, sufficient funds with which to enforce that act. It would be similar to having a municipality adopt an ordinance, but then refuse to provide funds with which to hire the necessary policemen. Passing an ordinance and then firing the policeman is not the way in which Congress should do business.

By a 3-to-1 vote in both Houses of Congress, the Congress said it wanted mergers which threaten our economic system looked into by the Federal Trade Commission; and Congress said that if there are mergers which tend to create

a monopoly or substantially lessen competition, orders of divestiture should be issued by the Federal Trade Commission.

Since January 1 of this year there have been 238 mergers or acquisitions, one corporation buying up another. I have a list of them before me. Many of those mergers are very substantial in nature. Many of them undoubtedly violate section 7 of the Clayton Act. Therefore, under the amendment passed by Congress, certain of those mergers are inimical to the public interest.

No funds are available for the purpose of even making investigations as to the 238 mergers which have occurred since the beginning of the present year. No funds are available for determining the facts in regard to these mergers. No funds are available to bring prosecution under the Federal Trade Act, as is required by section 7.

As an example of the cost of prosecuting a case under section 7 of the Clayton Act, I have before me the figures in regard to the expenses involved from November 1, 1947, to April 1, 1951, in the Federal Reserve Board's Transamerica case. In that case a section 7 prosecution was brought against the Bank of America, the Federal Reserve Board administering this act with respect to banking. That case was brought under the same act which the Federal Trade Commission exercises with respect to commerce and industry. The cost of that case so far—and it has not yet been finished—is \$342,210. Approximately one-half of the cost is for salaries.

With 238 substantial mergers taking place in the first 5 months of this year, certainly the Federal Trade Commission will need more funds with which to investigate such mergers, and with which to prosecute the ones which should be prosecuted, than the Federal Reserve Board spent in prosecuting the Bank of America case.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the case of anti-monopoly matters—for instance, under section 7 which applies the antimonopoly laws to the purchase of assets, rather than simply to the purchase of stock, as was formerly the case—does the Senator from Tennessee realize that the FBI does considerable work in connection with the investigations? Does the Senator realize that the FBI receives its funds for that purpose from the Department of Justice, rather than from the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Section 7 of the Clayton Act gives authority to the Federal Trade Commission to make the investigations. Of course, in order to issue an order under section 7, it would be necessary for the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation. We know that 238 mergers have occurred during the first 5 months of the present year, but the Federal Trade Commission has not been able to do anything whatsoever about them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that when suit is brought under the anti-monopoly law, the case goes to the Department of Justice, and is handled by

what is known as its antimonopoly section, which joins with the FBI in making the investigation? In this case the Federal Trade Commission desires to have its own investigators, rather than to use the present investigating staff, which is the FBI.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is approximately three-quarters wrong in regard to what occurs in such cases.

By law, the original investigation is required to be made by the Federal Trade Commission. It is the Federal Trade Commission which is required to investigate the 238 mergers which have already occurred in the past 5 months. After the Federal Trade Commission issues a complaint, the Department of Justice has the right to appear before the Commission and argue for or against the merger. The Department of Justice, of course, has charge of all appeals to the Supreme Court. But in all cases, the responsibility for making the investigation rests upon the Federal Trade Commission, under sections 7 and 11 of the Clayton Act.

The history of the past few years discloses that Congress has very rarely, if ever, given the Federal Trade Commission sufficient funds with which to conduct its activities. I have before me a study of the appropriations of the FTC, included in a report entitled "United States against Economic Concentration and Monopoly," which is a report conducted by the Small Business Committee of the House a few years ago. It shows, over a period of many years, what has happened to Federal Trade Commission appropriations. Let us take a typical year, 1949. The amount requested was \$6,000,000, which was reduced to \$3,850,000 by the Bureau of the Budget, and later, by the Congress, to \$3,622,000. In 1950, the amount requested was \$5,600,000, in which the Bureau of the Budget made a cut to \$3,738,000, after which it was cut a little bit more in the Congress. For 1952, a request was made for \$5,833,000, which was cut by the Bureau of the Budget to \$4,392,000, and it was further reduced in the Appropriations Committee to the amount of \$3,989,130.

The duties of the Federal Trade Commission are already so great that it cannot divert any funds from any of its other activities for the purpose of enforcing section 7 of the Clayton Act. I should like to have inserted in the Record at this point a brief statement of all the duties of the Federal Trade Commission for which allocations of money have been made in this appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

In the administration of the five statutes committed to its jurisdiction, the principal responsibilities of the Commission are:

1. To promote free and fair competition in interstate commerce in the interest of the public through prevention of price-fixing agreements, boycotts, combinations in restraint of trade, other unfair methods of competition, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices (Federal Trade Commission Act, sec. 5).

2. To safeguard the consuming public by preventing the dissemination of false or deceptive advertisements of food, drugs, cosmetics, and devices (Federal Trade Commission Act, secs. 12 through 15).

3. To prevent certain unlawful price and other discriminations, exclusive-dealing and tying contracts and arrangements, acquisitions of the stock and assets of competitors, and interlocking directorates (Clayton Act, secs. 2, 3, 7, and 8).

4. To protect producers, manufacturers, distributors, and consumers from the unrevealed presence of substitutes and mixtures in manufactured wool products (Wool Products Labeling Act).

5. To supervise the registration and operation of associations of American exporters engaged solely in export trade (Export Trade Act).

6. To petition for the cancellation of the registrations of trademarks which were illegally registered or which have been used for purposes contrary to the intent of the Trade-Mark Act of 1946 (Lanham Trade-Mark Act).

7. To gather and make available to the Congress, the President, and the public, factual data concerning economic and business conditions as a basis for remedial legislation where needed, and for the guidance and protection of the public (Federal Trade Commission Act, sec. 6).

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator will permit, I may say I understand the situation to be as follows: The budget estimate for the Federal Trade Commission was \$4,392,000. The House committee cut that by \$255,600, to \$4,136,400. Then, on the floor, on motion by Representative KEATING, the House made an additional cut of \$244,705 to \$3,891,695.

The subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee restored \$250,000 of that, for the enforcement of the amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act adopted last year, and to restore the floor cut which was made, so as to make the appropriation, \$4,141,695. This was followed by the 10-percent cut, which was made by the committee following the vote on the floor recently, which reduced the appropriation to the present amount in the bill, namely, \$3,989,130.

The Senator from Tennessee would add \$407,870 to the amount recommended by the committee, so as to bring the appropriation up to the original budget estimate of \$4,392,000. I should like to call to the Senate's attention the fact that the Federal Trade Commission, in its request for restoration of the House floor cut, asks for only \$135,000 for the purpose of enforcing the new law. The remainder of the amount asked by the Commission is for activities already underway. It would mean, then, that if we tried to cut—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I may finish one sentence—

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to correct the Senator on one thing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I have made a misstatement, I shall yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield, without losing the floor, for the purpose of allowing the

Senator from South Carolina to ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I desire to stand corrected, if I have made a misstatement.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would merely suggest that the Commission originally requested \$500,000 for the purpose indicated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct; and the committee cut it in half, to \$250,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. I merely wanted to call it to the attention of the Senator, because the House allowed \$135,000. Of course, the Senate restored about \$250,000 of the House cut, following which the 10-percent cut came into play.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The effect of it was to make the increase which the Senate committee had provided \$97,435, according to my understanding.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding, also.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to make a brief statement. No one appreciates the Federal Trade Commission more than I do, but of course I could not support the Senator from Tennessee on this amendment, nor could I support the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from New Hampshire in a further reduction.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield, but first I would like to observe that the Federal Trade Commission, as the Senator will find by referring to page 572 of the record, originally asked the Bureau of the Budget for \$950,000 with which to enforce section 7 of the Clayton Act. The President recommended \$500,000 for the purposes of enforcement of the law. As the matter finally eventuates, with the Ferguson amendment, the appropriation is \$97,435 more than it was last year.

This amount is not adequate to even begin the enforcement of section 7 of the Clayton Act. Of course, a large portion of the Commission's other funds must be spent in enforcing the other laws which Congress has given it to administer, such as the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Wool Products Labeling Act, the Export Trade Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and other acts.

It is manifest that the intention of Congress in amending section 7 cannot be carried out by the Federal Trade Commission with any \$97,000. We passed a law imposing a responsibility on the Commission. We desire to protect small business. We want it to conduct investigations of monopolistic mergers. We want it to issue orders of divestiture where competition is lessened; yet we do not provide the Federal Trade Commission with resources to carry on these functions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to correct one statement I made to the Senator from Tennessee. I said that the Federal Trade Commission requested that \$135,000 be restored. That was from the House floor action. It does not take into consideration Senate committee action.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That would be \$400,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, for the full budget; but that would not be for the new law alone. What I was going to do was to separate the amount to be expended in connection with the new law from other expenditures of the Commission.

As nearly as I can determine the amount, between \$200,000 and \$250,000 would be a fair figure for the enforcement. In the judgment of the Federal Trade Commission, that would represent a fair amount to be expended in connection with enforcement of the new law alone, apart from other activities.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the explanation of the \$130,000 is that, after the House committee had allowed \$250,000 for the enforcement of section 7, a request was made for \$130,000, or a little more in addition thereto, in order to increase the figure to \$402,000, as I recall. I think that is substantially what is now being proposed by my amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think there is no difference between the Senator and myself in our understanding of the figure.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not believe there is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think it would be a fair statement that between \$200,000 and \$250,000 is what the members of the Federal Trade Commission had in mind, as evidenced by their own words, as representing the amount which they believed would be necessary in connection with enforcement of the new section of the law.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But that would be in addition to what they were allowed by the House committee. They have always insisted that they should have \$950,000. That is the figure they have requested, but the Bureau of the Budget cut it to \$500,000. In any event, the record shows that there will be but \$97,000 for the enforcement of section 7. One case, just one case, which was brought by the Federal Reserve Board under section 7, and which has not even been completed, has thus far cost \$342,000.

During the first 5 months of this year there have been 338 substantial mergers in violation of section 7, which need to be investigated. The Federal Trade Commission is helpless to do anything about these mergers. In my opinion, Mr. President, if we pass a law and then fail to appropriate funds for its enforcement, we are not being fair to the persons who demanded that this loophole in the old section 7 be plugged. If it was in the public interest that the new section 7 be passed, the Senate and the House should support the expression of public opinion, as made by Congress, by appropriating funds for investigations to be made and suits to be brought.

Mr. President, there are some places where economy is not in the best interest of the Nation. It is not in the best interest of the Nation to permit mergers and consolidations which are monopolistic in character to continue unchallenged. The law was passed by a 3-to-1 majority, after a long fight over a period of 20 years. The will of Congress will be frustrated if adequate funds are not provided for the enforcement of the law.

So I hope, Mr. President, that my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

On page 127 of the House hearings it appears that \$202,205 was requested for the trade practice conference. Perhaps that is a good thing; I do not know. I have been advised that this activity has not worked out very satisfactorily. There is no statutory authority for it. Although such authority has been requested over the years, Congress has never given the authority, and we are now asked to appropriate a quarter of a million dollars to this agency when this activity has not been authorized by the Congress.

I also desire to point out, as a matter of record, that the Federal Trade Commission is doing so-called defense work for other agencies. The Senate hearings disclose that \$200,000 is being given the Federal Trade Commission by OPS and NPA. I point out to the Members of the Senate that, instead of doing that work with their own employees, thereby saving money for the taxpayers, the Federal Trade Commission has hired extra employees to do work for which other agencies are paying.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator spell out the names of those agencies, instead of giving merely the abbreviations?

Mr. WHERRY. The NPA is the National Production Authority. FTC is the Federal Trade Commission, and OPS is the Office of Price Stabilization. The Federal Trade Commission is doing work for those two agencies. I agree that the work has to be done, but the Federal Trade Commission offered to do the work because it did not have enough for its employees to do; yet it hires new employees to do work which has been referred to it in addition to what it already has to do.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know whether the additional employees have been engaged temporarily, or are they permanent?

Mr. WHERRY. I suppose they were put on as temporary employees, but after employees are engaged, the Government keeps finding things for them to do.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. "Temporary" means "permanent" in the Government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In reference to the trade practice conferences, the Appropriation Committees of both Houses have appropriated a certain amount of

money to be used for that purpose whether or not the work has been authorized by subsequent legislation. The Federal Trade Commission could not take money appropriated for this purpose and use it in connection with section 7 activities.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree that the Senator is correct. They tried to get an authorization. On the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House someone finds that these activities ought to be appropriated for, and the first thing we know an appropriation has been provided. If we had a test vote, the provision would not be agreed to. I point out to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that we have been unable to get a statute providing for these conferences. It has been refused by the committees. As is very often done, when an agency cannot get an authorization, it tries to get an appropriation, and then wants an authorization. I am saying that this particular feature has not been authorized by the Congress. While it has been appropriated for, I doubt that Commission can get an authorization.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator will yield further, I do not know much about this trade-practice conference work which has been carried on by the Commission for many years, but assuming that we gave the agency funds for a purpose for which we should not have provided the money, that is no reason to forbid the agency from carrying on an activity which has been specifically and recently approved by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not telling any agency what to do, but I think the proper thing is to come to the House and the Senate and get an authorization, and then ask for an appropriation. The agency here involved has not done so. If the distinguished Senator can show me that this activity is authorized by law, I shall be glad to give further consideration to the appropriation. But as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I feel that appropriations should not be made for this purpose until the Senate and the House authorize the Federal Trade Commission to do this very thing.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, the appropriation about which I am speaking is one which has been authorized by Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator is talking about increasing the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission by \$400,000. He is talking about everything he can think of to help out the Federal Trade Commission. I am resisting the Senator's amendment. The first thing I have talked about is the trade practice conferences, which I say have not been authorized. I have other reasons why I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am not asking any money for the trade practice conference work. I agree that until the agency has received authorization for a purpose it should not receive any appropriation. I am talking about section 7, which by a 3-to-1 vote has been authorized.

Mr. WHERRY. I realize that. I think that instead of increasing the appropriations, we should decrease them. The Commission will still have sufficient employees for the enforcement of the Clayton Act, about which the Senator is speaking.

Does the Senator wish to ask another question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The record shows that the Commission has not had anyone to assign to the work. I ask the Senator if he would not agree that with 238 mergers already having taken place since the law was passed, at the rate of 50 a month, \$97,000 is insufficient and that the agency is going to need more money if it is to take action under section 7?

Mr. WHERRY. It might be that if the Federal Trade Commission received all the authorizations it desired, what the Senator says would be true. I am giving to the present occupant of the chair and to the Members of the Senate my experience in connection with these matters as a member of the Appropriations Committee. I say it is not necessary to increase the Federal Trade Commission's appropriation \$400,000. The Commission has ample funds to do the job it is intended to do if it stays within its particular authorization. But, like many other Government agencies, the minute it gets started it wants to take over this and take over that. It offered to do defense work for another agency. It suggested it could do the work. After they are once given the authority, then what happens? They hire new employees to make surveys for OPS and for NPA, work which the latter two agencies are supposed to do with their own personnel. Yet the FTC increases its own personnel tremendously to do such work.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield in a moment. In view of the fact that the two latter agencies were established to carry on special work, there is no reason to give money to the FTC with which it may carry on the same work, unless the FTC will do such work with its own staff, rather than restaffing with employees who will carry on work of the other two agencies.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Nebraska is absolutely correct in his statement. What he points out is true, that not only one, but a great many so-called civilian agencies of government are rushing in as fast as they can to justify increased appropriations. Why? Because they propose to do the work necessitating the increased appropriations, for defense purposes. We are appropriating money for defense agencies, and those agencies have certain work to do. Civilian agencies are now using the limited war, or police action, whatever the administration calls it in Korea, to justify their requests for more money. Such practices should be absolutely stopped.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. He has very forcefully made an observa-

tion which is completely in accord with the thinking of the junior Senator from Nebraska respecting the FTC.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska, if the record does not show that the work done by the FTC for other agencies was done for them by reason of the fact that the FTC already had trained investigators and kept certain permanent records which these other agencies wished to make use of; that these other agencies called on the FTC for the staff and records which the FTC had, and that those other agencies reimbursed the FTC for that work? That is a matter which does not enter into this consideration of appropriations at all.

Mr. WHERRY. If it is necessary for the OPS or the NPA to make surveys, they can do so with the staff they already have. They do not need to come to the Federal Trade Commission for such service. In fact, the Federal Trade Commission went to those agencies and asked to be permitted to make the surveys. There is no reason why the two agencies which were established to do certain work should give money to the Federal Trade Commission with which to carry on the work. If the FTC were to do such work, it should do it with its own staff. It did not do so, however. Obviously, if additional help were required, OPS and NPA could have hired such additional help, without turning over any work to FTC to perform. We have appropriated money for OPS and NPA with the idea that they would carry on their own work, and not with the idea that another agency should ask for money to perform duplicate work.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding the Senator from Nebraska to say that we have appropriated money to the OPS and NPA with which to carry out the act which was passed in relation to them?

Mr. WHERRY. We have appropriated money to reimburse NPA and OPS for work that FTC is doing. That is what I mean. If we increase the amount by \$400,000, we shall continue to appropriate money to FTC which I believe they should not have. Let me give the Senate another illustration. Let us consider the prosecutions of violations of the Antimonopoly Act. What happens?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the previous subject, will he yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to finish my observation first, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

In the illustration I am about to give, we find duplication by a department of work done in another department. I believe the Department of Justice ought to conduct the prosecutions in cases of violations of the antimonopoly law. I do not believe the Federal Trade Commission should be staffed for that purpose. The Department of Justice has one staff, and the FTC has another staff, and how they keep out of each other's hair is more than I know. I believe the

time has come when such money as is appropriated to FTC for the prosecution of antimonopoly violation cases should go to the Department of Justice. One agency only should be engaged in prosecuting, while the other agency should be engaged in determining the facts upon which the prosecution should be based.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I have given another case wherein agencies were duplicating the work done by each other. We are paying for such duplication. The question is, Are we getting any results?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In any event the FTC is required by law to do its own prosecuting. The Senator from Nebraska may disagree with that, but there we have the requirement of law.

Mr. WHERRY. I disagree with that. I believe the Department of Justice should, by law, do the prosecuting.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the Senator not agree that section 11 of the Clayton Act says that the prosecution shall be undertaken by the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. WHERRY. I agree, but in their own sphere. That is true. But what has developed is a duplication of prosecution. We may have a prosecution by the Attorney General for violation of a case which the FTC has prosecuted and acted upon. The party involved can be picked up and prosecuted again by the Department of Justice, so the FTC prosecution does not mean anything. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee is a lawyer. He knows as well as I do what ought to be done. He knows that all the prosecutions ought to be turned over to the Department of Justice where they belong, and that the FTC is the agency which should find the facts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Department of Justice has virtually taken the position that it will not enforce the Robinson-Patman Act and virtually declines to prosecute under that act; so that if the law is to be enforced—and I presume it is the intention of the law that it shall be enforced—it will have to be the Federal Trade Commission that will do the prosecuting? Is not that the skeleton in the closet which should be brought out into the open?

Mr. KEFAUVER. If I may answer that—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me make an observation.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. What the Senator from Illinois has said is true. In my opinion, the Department of Justice has defied the will of Congress in refusing to conduct prosecutions under the Robinson-Patman Act. The Department of Justice refused to participate in the Standard Oil Co. case, which was decided in the Supreme Court just a few weeks ago. Hence unless the Federal Trade Commission had its own staffs, at least as to the Robinson-Patman Act, no prosecution would be brought.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to mention something concerning the FTC's activities in the Standard Oil case. We are seeking to bring about economy. We are doing everything we can for national defense. Everyone wants every dime possible to be used for national-defense purposes. But we are trying to effect a saving of six or seven billion dollars in the interest of protecting the value of the dollar, in the interest of stopping inflation, in doing whatever we can to bring about savings which are advocated by those who believe in economy. I am pointing out the places where the Federal Trade Commission can save money.

The other day I was very much inclined to offer an amendment in committee to cut the FTC appropriation, but I did not do so because I felt that the way to accomplish the purpose was to offer new legislation the purpose of which would be to transfer the prosecution of cases from the FTC to the Department of Justice. I intend to introduce such a bill at the proper time. I think that is the way it should be done. But under the theory they are working for defense, the FTC have asked to conduct investigations for OPS and NPA, and have employees running all over the country, duplicating the work of agencies which came to Congress asking for money and saying that such work was necessary to be done. We gave them the money they asked for. Now they are asking FTC to do the work, and FTC hires extra help to do the very work the NPA and the OPS should have done for themselves.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Much of the information they obtain from the Bureau of Internal Revenue and from the Treasury has resulted in investigations by these Government agencies which have aroused the people of the country.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Every time we turn around we find an investigation being conducted by an agency. When in this instance we try to effect a saving we are met with an amendment offered on the floor, the purpose of which is to increase the amount for the FTC. If there is one agency in the entire Government which will be mighty lucky to obtain appropriations on the present basis, I think it is the FTC. I do not believe they should receive appropriations unless they can thoroughly justify them. Those are my feelings. I have no ulterior motives in regard to this agency. Some of my best friends are employed by it. I am giving the Senate the truth based on experience and on questions I asked of representatives of FTC in the Appropriations Committee.

I desire the Record to show that I want the Federal Trade Commission to pursue effectively its functions and administer the laws over which it has authority, without duplication of the work of other agencies, or seeking to expand its authorities by interpretation, rather than by law.

Certainly one of its responsibilities is the administration of the amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act, passed at the end of the Eighty-first Congress, to correct a weakness in the original act,

which permitted the merging and absorption of business through purchase of a company's assets without purchasing its stock. There is no doubt that such a loophole has contributed in years past to greater concentration of economic power.

However, my difference with the junior Senator from Tennessee with respect to his amendment, is that he proposes a \$400,000 over-all additional appropriation for FTC, whereas I believe the FTC appropriation as approved by the committee provides sufficient funds for the Commission to begin its enforcement of the amendment to the Clayton Act—and for its other administrative work, as well.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Nebraska is on several subcommittees with me.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that time after time we find that an appropriation is made for one activity, and turned over bodily to another activity?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is bad government. It is dishonest government.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished and able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has had such a long experience with appropriations.

I asked the prosecuting officers of the Federal Trade Commission: "Under the antimonopoly act, when do you start the prosecution, and when does the Department of Justice start a prosecution? Do both of you join and prosecute at the same time, or do you make the prosecution, followed by a prosecution by the Department of Justice?"

He replied, "We supplement the work of each other."

Mr. President, that is ridiculous. If one department is authorized to make the prosecution, and is equipped and staffed, and has the money to make it, if it is the department which should do it, its work should not be supplemented by that of the Federal Trade Commission or some other agency which is doing the same thing.

I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, the very able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for bringing to the attention of Members of the Senate the fact that time and time again we uncover in the Appropriations Committee duplicate appropriations going to agencies which are doing almost identical work, and which are trampling over each other trying to get the work done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The record shows that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is asking for \$3,700,000 for 1952. This would allow them 605 employees. It seems to the Senator from Michigan that if we are to have investigators in the Federal Trade Commission who are to work up the cases, and then transfer the cases to the De-

partment of Justice, the agents of the Department of Justice who are to sit in court and actually try the case must review all the work of the Federal Trade Commission. I think the time has come when we must consolidate the work. It is not a question of not spending the money for prosecution of antitrust violations. It is a question of saving money and spending it wisely for the actual prosecutions, so that convictions can be obtained.

The enforcement of the antimonopoly law, so far as the United States is concerned, is a disgrace. There can be no doubt about that. Prosecutions have been brought, and after the case has been tried in court the parties finally enter into a consent decree. The monopoly is allowed to exist for years, and finally a consent decree is entered, under which the defendant is fined a few thousand dollars.

When the antimonopoly law was originally enacted it was not intended that the Department should do the investigating. We placed in the law a provision for triple damages, so that the Department would not be required to police various businesses. In the case of a small manufacturer—or even a large one—if his business were being interfered with by a monopoly, he would have the incentive to collect the evidence and start the case. By virtue of his effort in obtaining the evidence, he would receive triple damages.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I have the floor. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan so that he may ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee, provided these observations new to the line. I am not farming out any time for any Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Michigan has confused the Sherman Act with the Clayton Act. It is the Sherman Act under which the Department of Justice has exclusive jurisdiction. The Federal Trade Commission has nothing whatsoever to do with the Sherman Act, which is the law under which consent decrees have been entered. The Federal Trade Commission enforces the Clayton Act, including section 2, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. If it did not administer this act the Robinson-Patman Act cases would not be prosecuted, because the Department of Justice refuses to prosecute such cases—at least it refused in the Standard Oil case.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator state the reason why the Department of Justice refuses to prosecute?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Department of Justice made its own interpretation of what was good economics, and decided, in effect, that the Robinson-Patman Act, enacted by Congress, is undesirable. So the Department simply refuses to support the prosecution. It refused to argue the case before the Supreme Court.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator appreciates, does he not, that the head of the Department of Justice is a lawyer and a former Member of the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. A very distinguished lawyer.

Mr. FERGUSON. And a very distinguished former Member of this body. He is a Cabinet officer. Therefore, would it not be well, if he interprets the law in that way, for the United States Government to follow the Department of Justice, which is the chief law adviser to the administration, and which is headed by a Cabinet officer? Does not the Senator feel that the position of the Department of Justice should be followed rather than the position of an agency which is not headed by a Cabinet officer? Does not the Senator feel that the Department headed by a Cabinet officer should take the burden of performing the function of prosecuting cases?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The point is that the Department of Justice has always disagreed with the theory of the Robinson-Patman Act. It has always felt that under any and all circumstances the meeting of a competitor's price in good faith should be an absolute defense to a suit brought under the Robinson-Patman Act. The Congress, according to the interpretation most of us have given the law, said that good faith should be only a procedural defense. Thus, if we had to rely upon the Department of Justice, the Robinson-Patman Act would not be enforced.

But the principal point I wish to again emphasize is that if a law is to be changed, it should be changed in an orderly manner. But let us not deny an agency the appropriation required to carry out a law which Congress has enacted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is on that theory that I do not at this time offer an amendment to cut the appropriation of the Federal Trade Commission. I have already made such a statement on the floor of the Senate. I have already stated to my distinguished friend that I agree with him. I believe that the orderly way is to change the law, which I propose to try to do.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the hearings before the subcommittee on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1952, at page 574. This covers the very point which I have been discussing. This is Mr. Edwards speaking:

I have here a letter which arrived since the beginning of the hearing, from Eric Johnston, addressed to Mr. Mead as Chairman, and sent down from Mr. Mead's office, which says, in part:

"Prior commitments will prevent me from appearing before the Independent Offices Subcommittee in support of the profit-data phases of your reporting program. However, I would like to take this means to express our substantial interest in your profit-reporting activities and express my hope that they will be continued. As you well know, we have found the profit data for the manufacturing segment of the economy."

That is what we now get—
"most useful as an aid in formulating stabilization policy and in connection with the evaluation of price action. We also look forward to receiving profit data from the trade segment of the Commission, which you are currently collecting for us under contract."

"I trust that the Appropriations Committees of Congress will see fit to permit the continuance of your valuable profit-reporting program."

AVAILABLE FUNDS

The program which we are carrying on is important enough to them so that as I left my office this morning I was told that they are now in process of preparing a request for us to get the figures for an additional base year for the manufacturing end of the program for a new sum of money, which they will supply.

Senator ELLENDER. How much money have they supplied you up to the moment?

He is talking about OPS supplying the money to do a job which has been assigned to the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. EDWARDS. They have supplied us for the current fiscal year with \$125,000. That includes a sum for equipment, which is non-recurring.

It is estimated also that the additional funds which they will supply us to keep the program going will run at the rate of \$200,000 a year.

We are spending of our own money, out of our own appropriation, a little over \$100,000 a year for the manufacturing profit data.

Mr. President, that is an example of what I have contended all along, namely, that agencies do pay to other agencies for work performed for them. If NPA or OPS did not get enough money they should have come before the Committee on Appropriations. Instead, they gave \$125,000 of their money to do the job. Now FTC comes to Congress and asks for another appropriation to do the same job.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Since 1939 the Federal Trade Commission has been keeping profit data on manufacturing industries. Since they were already keeping the data, Mr. Eric Johnston decided to ask them for certain information. He asked them to expand their work along certain lines which he regarded as important to his agency. He then reimbursed the Commission. They are not asking for any appropriation for the work they are doing for Mr. Eric Johnston. If Mr. Johnston did not use the Commission to obtain the figures which he required, he would have to obtain them by other means—probably at greater cost. It made sense to Mr. Johnston, and it makes sense to me, to secure the information which he needs by calling on established agencies which for years have been providing this type of material, rather than establish duplicate operations. Mr. Johnston's action was an action designed to attain economy, for which he should be commended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is not the situation. FTC hired a great many employees to do the job which the Senator says they are already doing. If the job had to be done an appropriation should have been asked for it by NPA or OPS. They are the ones who are accountable to Congress. They should not be paying \$125,000 to another bureau, and have the bureau come to Congress and ask for reimbursement of the money which they paid to another agency. They should come before Congress in the first instance.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Federal Trade Commission is not asking for any appropriation for that work.

Mr. WHERRY. The Federal Trade Commission has asked for additional appropriations. They are resisting the cut-back. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee is asking that the appropriations be raised by several hundred thousand dollars. I am resisting the request under two theories. The first theory is based on the example which I have already given.

Let me go a little further. The House Small Business Committee studied the Federal Trade Commission last year. They made a complete study of all the claims that came up. The chairman of the committee, Representative PATMAN of Texas—and the junior Senator from Tennessee knows Representative PATMAN very well—filed a report. He filed House Report 3236, Eighty-first Congress, second session. At page 18 he discusses the "low level of morale among the employees"; the "internal strife and office politics that prevailed the agency"; the "many small cliques and groups whose chief interest is in personal authority and advancement"; the presence at FTC of "numerous prima donnas, persons who are looking for personal glorification and who seem to have scant appreciation of the need for teamwork"; and "among the older employees an attitude of indifference toward the work of the agency."

That criticism is contained in the report filed by the chairman of the committee, Representative PATMAN of Texas.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to read the conclusion. The conclusion is contained on page 44:

The conclusion reached by the committee in respect to the need on the part of the Federal Trade Commission for additional financial support presupposes the maximum degree of operating efficiency and an ability to render a dollar's worth of public service for each dollar appropriated.

Those are the words of Representative PATMAN, who went into all the activities of the Federal Trade Commission.

Unfortunately, this high level of operating efficiency does not exist today. We do not disparage the numerous worth-while efforts made by the present members to increase the Commission's effectiveness. We feel, however, that the progress made up to the present time is not sufficient to justify any very substantial increase in the Commission's appropriations.

Those are the words of Representative PATMAN, chairman of the committee which made the investigation of the activities of the FTC and filed its report in January 1951.

Yet the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] asks the Senate for an additional appropriation of \$400,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether it is not correct to say that the two items involved were very carefully studied by the committee. As I understand, they were discussed in committee, and proof was heard

with respect to them. We wish to meet every obligation. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] was perfectly fair about it. He wanted to do the right thing by the Federal Trade Commission.

No one has anything against the Federal Trade Commission. We wish to help it along. However, it appeared to the committee, after very careful study and consideration, that the amounts that should be recommended are those which are contained in the bill. A very careful study was given to the subject in committee. Such careful study has not been given to the subject on the floor. After very careful consideration the committee reported the amounts which are contained in the bill.

I hope that not only every member of the committee but that every Senator will vote against the two amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to make some further observations.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to finish with some observations. Then I shall be happy to yield.

The Federal Trade Commission has pursued a course of conduct which is directly contrary to the expressed will of Congress. It is also now pursuing conduct contrary to the interpretations of law by the Supreme Court. It is doing so at this very moment.

In thus directing its activities in a manner contrary to the objectives desired by Congress, the Commission is dissipating the funds appropriated by Congress.

Obviously, the appropriations are intended to carry out the policies directed by Congress. Furthermore, FTC's conduct requires substantial unnecessary expenditures by many business firms, which are compelled to pay the cost of litigation and controversies instigated by the Commission in disregard of the expressed will of Congress.

The junior Senator from Tennessee knows what I am talking about.

The Supreme Court has rendered a decision. Instead of obeying the Supreme Court's decision, the Federal Trade Commission sends its employees to Congress to lobby in an effort to get a contrary opinion. I say that is not the function of the Federal Trade Commission. If it is possible to do so, I should like to have that statement underscored with black ink. That is not the job of the Federal Trade Commission. Congress writes the laws. Congress is capable of writing the laws. Bureaus of the Government should interpret the laws in the same manner the Supreme Court interprets them. Congress writes the laws and the Supreme Court interprets them. If all we are to do is to appropriate the money and then have the Federal Trade Commission lobby for legislation which would go contrary to the decision of the Supreme Court, I say they violate the very purpose for which FTC was created.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Not at this point. I do not wish to get off the track. I wish to finish with my observations.

When Congress passed the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936 it refused to adopt the mill-net theory of price. Yet FTC argued this theory in the Cement case. Later it told Congress that it used mill-net merely as a method of exposition.

Even now, two cases before the Commission, the Chain case and the National Lead case, both of which have been pending for 5 years, still proceed under the mill-net theory.

Last August FTC wrote the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the effect that the cases would be decided in a few months, but they are still undecided. They are still undecided after 5 years. That is proper work for the FTC to perform. The Commission should get busy and decide some of its cases instead of trying to lobby Senators and Representatives to legislate against decisions with which they disagree.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I should like to finish my observations. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to ask a question on this point, I shall be glad to yield to him. There is no one to whom I would rather yield than to the Senator from Louisiana. If he wishes to ask me a question on this item, I am only too glad to yield. Does the Senator wish to ask a question on this point?

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Nebraska knows that a great many people lobby. I do not know whether the Federal Trade Commission has lobbied on this bill. Certainly all the cement companies are lobbying in Congress in an effort to try to enact a law which would permit them to resume the practices which were followed in past years.

Mr. WHERRY. That is beside the point. The Federal Trade Commission was created as an agency of the Congress. Its obligation is to enforce the laws which Congress passes, as those laws relate to the field in which the Federal Trade Commission operates. It is not the obligation or authority of the Federal Trade Commission to interpret those laws contrary to the will of Congress and then send its representatives to Congress as a lobby to attempt to persuade the Congress to enact legislation which will be directly contrary to the will of Congress. It is not the job of the Federal Trade Commission to lobby against legislation which will write upon the statute books the final determination made by the Supreme Court. Yet that is exactly what representatives of the Federal Trade Commission are doing; they are lobbying in that way, saying that the Supreme Court does not know what it is talking about and saying that the Congress does not know what it is talking about. Representatives of the Federal Trade Commission spend more time lobbying in Congress than they spend in doing anything else.

The truth of the matter is that the two cases I have mentioned have been before the Federal Trade Commission for 5 years. Yet it is impossible to ob-

tain a decision from the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. KEFAUVER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I intended to complete my statement before I yielded, Mr. President. However, inasmuch as I have already begun to yield, I shall yield now—first to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and then to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has said a number of times that certain persons are lobbying in Congress against the bill. Does the Senator have any knowledge of that, or is he simply referring to rumors?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee misunderstood me. I did not say that lobbyists were engaged in lobbying against this appropriation bill, but I said that the Federal Trade Commission has sent some of its own employees to Congress to lobby against the decisions in some of the cases which I mentioned a moment ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a law against that, and we should see to it that the law is enforced.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his observation.

Mr. President, in this connection let us consider the ECA. Recently we passed what is known as the Kem amendment, relative to the ECA. That amendment provides that the Secretary of Defense shall determine what materials are strategic materials, and that—by a mandate of the Congress—he shall not permit countries which are the recipients of ECA aid to export such strategic materials to satellite countries or to Russia, unless such exportations are in the interest of the national security of the United States of America.

However, what has happened? Just as soon as we put that law into effect, a horde of ECA employees begin to talk to Members of Congress and to send them documents, and they say to Members of Congress that the law will not work in Austria or in Norway; and the ECA officials say they will have to suspend all operations under the act if the Kem amendment remains in effect, instead of interpreting the act in accordance with the mandate of Congress, namely, determining whether the export of individual items is in the interest of our national security.

I can name agency after agency which, the moment Congress attempts to write a statute affecting it, sends hordes of its representatives to tell Members of Congress what to do. They even write speeches for a number of Members of Congress, who deliver them on the floor. If we wish to know the truth relative to some phases of this intricate subject, let me say that I have seen that very thing happen; I have seen copies of the speeches and I have heard them made. Certainly that happens on a wholesale basis.

At the moment I am not asking for further cuts to be made in the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission, although I am in favor of having that done. If any Senator will offer an amendment calling for a larger cut than the one now proposed, that will be satisfactory to me, and I shall vote for it.

However, I did not intend to propose at this time a larger cut in the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission. I prefer not to make such a proposal until after we act on an authorization in regard to the duties of the Federal Trade Commission. When we act in that connection, I think we should act in such a way as to see that the Federal Trade Commission does what it should do, namely, enforce the laws which it is required to enforce and perform the duties which are imposed upon it. Certainly it is not the duty of the Federal Trade Commission to permit its representatives to lobby with Members of Congress in regard to the Standard Oil case or any other case, or to attempt to lobby with the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], who is the son of another great Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know just what the Senator from Nebraska means when he refers to lobbying.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Tennessee knows what I am talking about.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me make it clear—

Mr. WHERRY. Let me make it clear that the Senator knows what lobbying I am talking, and he knows those who are lobbying against the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I cannot read the Senator's mind.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Tennessee does not have to do that.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But the Senator from Nebraska knows that I have been interested in the enforcement of section 7 of the Clayton Act for nearly 10 years. He knows that as a Member of the House I introduced bills to amend section 7 as early as 1945? Does he know that I presented my case for the bill before the House Judiciary Committee of the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses and before the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Eighty-first Congress? Therefore, I wish to see the Congress provide sufficient funds to enable the Federal Trade Commission to perform the duties which have devolved upon it by Congress under that Act. Certainly, if a Senator requests a list of the mergers and similar information, I do not think the Senator from Nebraska should classify the submission of that material as lobbying. Are we to understand that furnishing Members of the Senate with information which Senators request constitutes lobbying? The submission of material upon request is the only so-called lobbying I know of.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may conclude, I should like to say that in passing Senate bill 1008 last year, Congress said it favored permitting sellers to reduce their prices in good faith to meet competition. The Senate said

that, and so did the House of Representatives. In the Standard Oil Co. case the Supreme Court said the present law gives the seller that right. However, in both the Standard Brands case and the Minneapolis-Honeywell case, now pending in the courts, the Federal Trade Commission argues that the sellers can reduce their prices to meet competition only if in each case permission is obtained from the Federal Trade Commission. The Federal Trade Commission is attempting to require the seller to obtain such permission in each individual case in which the seller wishes to meet competition. That is why I favor turning this entire matter over to the Department of Justice.

The Federal Trade Commission and its lobbyists now say they need more money in order to be able to go through lengthy and expensive proceedings every time a seller wishes to meet a competitor's price. Mr. President, the result of permitting the Federal Trade Commission to go through long, expensive proceedings each time a seller wishes to meet a competitor's price will be, in effect, to destroy the right which Congress approved and which the Supreme Court has said presently exists. However, of course, the Federal Trade Commission does not agree about that, so the Commission wishes to have \$400,000 more appropriated to it, to permit it to bolster up its appropriations to such an extent that it will be able to do what it pleases.

In Senate bill 1008, Congress said it favored permitting sellers to reduce their prices in order to meet competition, and in the Standard Oil Co. case the Supreme Court said that the right to engage in good-faith competition was a necessary right in order to preserve a competitive economy. Mr. President, I am interested in preserving a competitive economy, and I am interested in having that right preserved. That opinion was handed down by the Supreme Court. However, in its report on Senate bill 719, the Federal Trade Commission urges Congress to reverse the Supreme Court's decision, although the Court's decision was in accord with the express will of the Congress and the Federal Trade Commission is supposed to be an arm of the Congress.

Last year the Federal Trade Commission's Chairman, Mr. Mead, testified before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the Commission was concerned only with the laws as passed by Congress, and that it could not be concerned with the consequences of those laws. He said that the Commission's obligation was only to carry into effect the laws passed by the Congress, and that it was the obligation of Congress to have constantly in mind the effect of the laws on the welfare and well-being of the country. Yet, Mr. President, instead of the Federal Trade Commission discharging its obligation in connection with enforcing a law which Congress has passed in performing its constitutional duty of considering the welfare and well-being of the country, it devotes its time and energy to fighting the Congress and to defying the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. That is exactly what I mean.

Mr. President, that is why I rise in opposition to this amendment. The Federal Trade Commission does not need any more funds in order to be able to perform its functions, as authorized by the Congress. In fact, the Senator from Tennessee, who is a lawyer, should join with me and we should place the prosecution of these cases in the Department of Justice, where they belong, and we should do a few other things in connection with the Federal Trade Commission. We should wipe out the strife in the Commission and should see to it that something worth while is done by it. When we provide for that, I believe Representative PATMAN and the other Members of Congress will go along with us.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Did the Senator from Nebraska say the hearings before the Commission had continued for 5 years?

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is correct.

Mr. FREAR. The Senator will recall, no doubt, that up until about a year ago the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission was a member of the Senator's own party, and a very distinguished man.

Mr. WHERRY. The Chairman of the Commission is Mr. Mead.

Mr. FREAR. I refer to the former Chairman. He was a member of the Senator's own party, was he not?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know whether or not one good Republican in the Federal Trade Commission can handle all the Democratic members of it; I am not sure. [Laughter.]

As a matter of fact, I do not know whether the former Chairman was a Republican. The only Chairman of the Commission with whom I have had anything to do is Chairman Mead. I have great respect for him. I do not know what the trouble is, but we find the chairman of the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives, Representative PATMAN himself, who is one of the authors of the Robinson-Patman Act which the FTC administers, in no uncertain terms condemning this Commission. He says they should not have another dime, until there is evidence on the part of the Commission that they want to get along, and that they want to do some good. Yet we continue to appropriate—for what major reason? To permit a few of them, whom one good Republican cannot handle, to come to the Capitol and tell us what we cannot do in the matter of legislation.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to my good friend from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. I think I can support the Senator's point of view without much difficulty at all.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FREAR. But I wish to bring out the fact that it is not merely a matter of who is chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and of whether he be a distinguished member of the Senator's party or a member of our party. The fact remains that the men in those agencies are lobbying on the hill, and cer-

tainly I am one who objects to it. I should like to ask the Senator whether the persons from the agencies who are at the Capitol lobbying are on the Government payroll while doing the lobbying?

Mr. WHERRY. I think there can be no question about that.

Mr. FREAR. Then I believe it is the duty of Senators on the floor of the Senate as well as members of the Appropriations Committee, to see that appropriations are not provided for purposes in connection with which they engage in such lobbying.

Mr. WHERRY. We might write a limitation in the legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I simply wish to assure my distinguished friend from Delaware that when Government employees come to the Capitol to attempt to influence the committee they are serving no good.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not refer to the committee. I say they are lobbying with Members of the Senate and Members of the House. They are doing more than that. Publicly they are doing all they can, by means of letters, telephone calls, and every other means, to thwart absolutely the intent of Congress. I think most Senators on the floor know that to be so, and would say that I am correct in my statement, and that the statement is not excessive to any degree.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude by thanking the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his observations. He has hit the nail exactly on the head. If the Federal Trade Commission wants to show good faith, and wants to correct its vices, and all that goes with them, as outlined by Representative PATMAN, the chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, in the report submitted by him; if the members of the Federal Trade Commission comply with that report by cleaning up the Commission and doing the job they ought to be doing within their own agency, administering their functions as the Congress intends the Commission should, then they can come before us with clean hands to request appropriations. But until they do that the least we can do is to refuse to give them any more money than the Appropriations Committee felt to be justified to enable them to perform their functions during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield further to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. I should merely like to offer another comment, if I may, in view of the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. In his behalf, and in his defense, I should like to say that, so far as I am concerned, I do not believe that any of the lobbyists from the agencies downtown have had any undue influence on the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who is also chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the pending bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the Senator's remarks, and I thank him.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I do not believe the record should stand completely unanswered in regard to the statements just made by the distinguished minority leader. As a matter of fact, it is my feeling that it is not proper for Congress to attempt to put pressure upon independent agencies, to the extent that if the independent agencies carry out their duties as they see them, the Congress will, in effect, punish them, in the matter of their appropriations, for doing what those administering the agencies in their hearts feel to be right. The point was made that the Federal Trade Commission should not have been attempting to enforce the law against the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana when that company was engaged in a practice which was driving hundreds of independent filling station operators out of business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I will yield as soon as I complete this point. In my opinion, that is exactly what the Federal Trade Commission is for. The Commission was doing its duty as it saw it, and I might point out that the Federal Trade Commission won that case in the circuit court of appeals. Had one of the judges of the circuit court of appeals, who had been advanced to the Supreme Court, been able to vote on the last decision, it would have been only a 5 to 4 decision, in favor of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana. Because of that decision, small business is in very grave trouble today. The fair trade laws have been declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. The Robinson-Patman Act has been declared not to mean what it was supposed to mean, and small business is in danger of being completely destroyed by larger competitors. I say, Mr. President, that the Federal Trade Commission was doing the best it could, insofar as the performance of its duty was concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I will yield in a few moments. I have read the reports coming from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which say, in effect, that the Federal Trade Commission should enforce the law as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would like to have the law interpreted, and I have heard the inferences that, although the Congress did not override the veto of the President of the United States, a bill which never became law should be regarded as the substantive law of the United States, for the benefit of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, for the benefit of the Cement Institute, and certainly for a benefit accruing to the steel companies, who are asking us to change the law.

So far as the point which has been made regarding lobbying is concerned, I may say that every bit of information I can get from the Federal Trade Commission or from anyone else to show the harmful effects of the basing-point pricing system, or the type of discrimination which is being practiced by the

Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, which was shown in the very case we are discussing here, will be welcomed by the junior Senator from Louisiana. I shall seek it wherever I think it can be found. As a Member of the Senate, I believe I am entitled to such information.

I have no knowledge of any improper lobbying being done by the Federal Trade Commission. Let us recognize where the real lobbying is. I, personally, have been contacted. I have spent hours in conference with distinguished executives of some of the largest cement companies in America, who have asked me to go along with the bill which the Senate is expected to consider within the next few days, a bill proposing to change the anti-trust laws, in order that the Cement Institute of America and all its members may be able to continue making agreements among themselves as to what the public is to pay for cement without the public having absolutely anything to say about it. Perhaps they may be able to get such legislation; I do not know whether they will or not. But I know where the real lobbying is. I know where the influence is. I know where the campaign contributions will come from, if any are to be made.

So, Mr. President, let us not accuse the Federal Trade Commission of improper lobbying before the Congress because it gives to a few Members of the Congress the facts which we so earnestly seek.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana would not yield to me, so I should merely like to say, in my own time, that he may know where the campaign contributions are coming from, and I know where they will go. I repeat, I know where they will go; and that is a statement which is exactly true.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, some of us would like to find out about that. Where are they going? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Why was the basing point bill vetoed? There was no justification for the veto. Those of us who raise sugar beets and other farm products want to be able to raise those products and to deliver them to any market in the world; and, if we want to absorb the freight, I submit we have a right to do it. We are doing it in defense of the free economy and of the law of the land in the United States of America. Any Senator who stands on this floor to say that that legislation is only for the benefit of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana either does not know what is in the legislation, or misrepresents what is contained in it. I want that statement to be as strong as I can make it.

Without in any way wishing to become involved in personalities with the Senator from Louisiana, I contend that if I want to sell and deliver a mule to a purchaser 50 miles from my home, and if I want to absorb a cost of, say \$25, in order to effect delivery, and in order to meet competition, anyone who says that is not in the interest of the little man; the only ones he has met are big-business men, including the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana.

Mr. President, one more thing. The Senator from Louisiana talks about the Robinson-Patman Act as though he were

one of its authors, and as if he were the only man who is interested in the protection of small business. I am willing to submit my record of service in the Senate for a period of 9 years, with respect to protecting small business, against the record of any other Member of the Senate, including the Senator from Louisiana, who continually makes charges of the kind he is now uttering. I am willing at any time to submit my record.

I want to ask if the Senator believes in Mr. PATMAN. He is the author of the act.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in order that I may answer his question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I think he is a distinguished gentleman, and I believe that the Commission's interpretation of the act is the very interpretation which the author of the act, Mr. PATMAN, put on it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not yield so that the Senator could make a speech.

The Senator said he believed in Mr. PATMAN. Let us see what Mr. PATMAN says with reference to the Commission:

The conclusion reached by the committee in respect to the need on the part of the Federal Trade Commission for additional financial support presupposes the maximum degree of operating efficiency and an ability to render a dollar's worth of public service for each dollar appropriated. Unfortunately, this high level of operating efficiency does not exist today. We do not disparage the numerous worth-while efforts made by the present members to increase the Commission's effectiveness. We feel, however, that the progress made up to the present time is not sufficient to justify any very substantial increase in the Commission's appropriation.

There is Mr. PATMAN's statement. He is the hero of the Senator from Louisiana. He is the man who he says is the champion of small business. He is a Member of the House. But as to his conclusions so far as the Federal Trade Commission is concerned, he says that until the Commission increases its efficiency, it should not have any increase in appropriations.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the Senator state the date of the report from which he read?

Mr. WHERRY. The House Small Business Committee studied the Federal Trade Commission last year, and the chairman filed a report in January 1951, House Report No. 3236, Eighty-first Congress, second session. What I quoted was from page 18 of that report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator from Nebraska know that Representative PATMAN made that statement at a time when vacancies were being filled on the Commission? Does he know that the statement was actually written before the enactment of H. R. 2734, amending section 7, on December 29, 1950, though filed a few days later? Does he know that Representative PATMAN feels much better about the Commission at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. I admit that Members of Congress can change their minds

overnight when it comes to appropriations.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, insofar as I am concerned, I have no particular knowledge of the appropriations or of whether a smaller or larger amount is needed. The point I had in mind was that I disliked to see the Commission criticized because it is making an attempt to protect small business, as I believe it should do. When Senate bill 1008 was before the Senate I was asked by some persons to support the bill and by others to fight it. I believe that small-business men have a very good idea about what is good for small business, and when they unanimously said that they believed the tactics pursued by certain large corporations were wrong, the probabilities were that they knew something of what they were talking about. Yet, after the Commission has been prosecuting certain corporations for 14 years, after many thousands of pages of evidence have been produced against them to prove what they have done has been against the best interests of the Nation, the corporations seek selfishly to change the law. If they are successful the probabilities are that they will return to the same kind of pricing practices they adopted in the past.

I pointed out that a commission enforcing the law in line with what it conceived its duty to be, for the benefit of the Nation and of small business, should not be criticized. If Congress does not like the way in which the Commission interprets the law, the law can be changed. Congress has declined to change the law up to this time. I am only too happy to have the Commission do what it can to protect the small independent merchants of the Nation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am somewhat fearful that we are slightly off the track as to what is being done here. We got into an argument over the question of the enforcement of antimonopoly laws. The appropriation requested is \$4,392,000. We have spent most of the time arguing and debating the question of the enforcement of a new section placed in the law as if the whole appropriation of \$4,392,000 were going to be used for the express purpose of enforcing section 7.

Section 7 is a new section which provides that it is unlawful to appropriate the accumulation of assets of corporations in such a way as to create a monopoly. Formerly, it was the accumulation of stock and interest of one corporation by another which was condemned by the law, and for which a corporation should be prosecuted. I happened to be a member of the subcommittee which heard the evidence on section 7 when the question was before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, the work of enforcement in the first year can be carried on without great appropriations, for the reason that the Commission had investigated the proposition and had brought large volumes of evidence before the committee prior to the time there was such a law, so as to convince the committee and the Congress that such a law was needed.

As I understand the process of enforcing antitrust laws, the Commission takes one of the best cases in which to start an action, and proceeds through the courts to get an interpretation. It is not going to start hundreds of cases during the first year. If it were to start all the cases it has before it, of 655 additional employees requested it is asking for only 139 in the antimonopoly bureau. So we are talking about 139 employees out of 655.

I hope that when Senators vote upon the pending amendment they will not base their action on a decision as to whether they are in favor of the enforcement of section 7, or the enforcement of the law requiring prosecution of corporations which create monopolies by buying the assets of smaller or even of greater corporations. When we vote let us bear in mind that the agency should perform its functions within a limit which will be proper in our present strained national emergency.

Mr. President, has this particular agency been wasteful? Has it used employees not needed in the enforcement of the antimonopoly laws? Let me give the Senate a little evidence which has been adduced, and which has not been disputed. I am not now referring to the Chairman of the Commission, who is an able and distinguished gentleman, but let me say to the Senate, that, as those who have examined the various Government commissions know, it is not the chairmen who know what is going on in the commissions. A chairman has much greater functions to perform in connection with the interpretation of rules and regulations and the creation of policies. Who runs such agencies? It is the lawyers, the economists, and the planners.

I see that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] raises his hand when I mention the word "economists." Economists disagree more often than do lawyers. I know what I am talking about, because I happen to be a lawyer.

Mr. President, the Chairman of the Commission does not know what is going on. Therefore Congress must determine how much money is needed. There are 10 full-time employees vouching the slips for the handling of \$191,000. The salaries paid these 10 employees, if they only get the average minimum of \$3,600 a year, is \$36,000. Think of it. An amount equal to one-fifth of the amount of the vouchers they are auditing is paid to the auditors. I am sure the distinguished economist from Illinois would say, as the Senator from Michigan would say, that this is too great a percentage to be paid simply for the auditing of these slips.

Mr. President, there are in this agency 35 employees in the Service and Supply Section. What do Senators suppose they service and supply? That must be surely the buying of red tape. Certainly, 35 employees would not be necessary to deal with supplies and equipment in this Commission, which has nothing whatever to do with the servicing of the Army. They are using 35 employees to purchase paper, and so forth, and 10 employees to audit the work of the 35. Just think of it—35 persons in this particular

agency are in the Service and Supply Section, a portion of whose duties is to buy the supplies and equipment and the furniture of the department, and there are 10 employees to audit the paper work of these 35.

Then the agency comes here and says that they cannot take a cut. Here we have an agency with 665 employees, many of whom are employed in the ways I have recounted to the Senate, yet the minute it is proposed to cut them \$1 they say, "You are going to take it out of prosecutions of cases for violation of the antimonopoly law. You are going to take it out of the man who is to enforce the particular law."

That reminds me of what happened to the Senator from Michigan when he proposed, in executive session of the committee, to cut a certain item in the Post Office Department appropriation. Within a short time the Senator from Michigan received complaints from Flint, Mich., from lawyers who wanted to know whether I proposed to close down the post office so they could not operate in Flint.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In looking at the itemized statement, as it appears in the side slips, or in the explanation of the various appropriations, I note that there is a \$40,708 increase for trade-practice conferences.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. THYE. I notice that there is an increase of \$5,252 in the item of printing and binding. Then there is an increase in the item of equipment, of \$4,252. We can go through various items and find similar increases, but we cannot obtain an intelligent explanation of why the increases are made. I wonder if the able Senator from Michigan can give me an explanation as to why there should be an increase of \$40,708 for trade-practice conferences. Why is such an increase needed?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will read to the Senator from Minnesota and to the Senate the reasons assigned in the hearings.

Mr. THYE. I have read the statement contained in the hearings, and I cannot find a common-sense, full explanation of what I am seeking in that statement. That is why I asked the Senator from Michigan if he could give me an explanation. The explanation contained in the hearings is found on page 562. I cannot find a sufficiently intelligent explanation in that statement for the proposed increase of \$40,708.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will say to the Senator that there is no real justification for the proposed increase.

The statement says:

Trade-practice conferences establish rules against unfair and illegal practices or methods of competition.

Mr. THYE. The statement proceeds to say, with respect to the rules established by the trade-practice conferences:

These rules covered the following industries: Peat, candy manufacturing, mail-order insurance, tie fabrics, wholesale optical, slide fastener, bedding manufacturing and wholesale distributing, cocoa and chocolate, fine and wrapping paper distributing, umbrella,

shoe finders, venetian blind, and parking meter.

Those are the items for which they want an additional \$40,708 with which to hold further conferences.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. That furnishes one reason why we should not get off the track and discuss the point whether we are going to enforce antimonopoly law violations. Here we have an item of more than \$40,000. Most of that can be eliminated and no harm done thereby. Perhaps better administration would result if the amount were cut off. We are talking about 139 employees at the most, whereas 655 are on the payroll.

Returning to what I was saying about Flint, Mich. What happened after I had made the proposal? The Post Office Department immediately got in touch with Flint. They thought they could put pressure on the Senator from Michigan by curtailing or eliminating certain mail deliveries that would do great harm to the State of Michigan.

That is not the only case of similar character. Senators know what happened when Congress attempted to make a cut in the customs service. Word went to every border State that a cut was to be made in the payroll of customs officials and border patrols, which would result in goods coming into the United States without being subject to any tariff duties or regulations whatsoever. That was the word that went forth simply because Congress attempted to cut one item.

Does the Senate realize what takes place when we have an item in an appropriation bill to cut the payroll of the ICC? Immediately the ICC gets in touch with the railroad interests, and their representatives come to the Senate and tell Senators that the cut would result in a serious curtailment in the work of inspecting the boilers of railroad engines. In spite of the number of employees on the payroll of the ICC one would think that the inspection of railroad engines would be crippled, with the result that an explosion might occur which would kill many persons.

Every time we endeavor to cut one item, either on the floor of the Senate or in committee, such a bogey man is raised, and the claim is made that the cut will result in real harm.

Surely, Mr. President, we are all in favor of enforcement of the antitrust laws and the antimonopoly laws. We want some violators of those laws to be sent to prison, as a deterrent against further violations. A prison sentence is a greater deterrent than the obtaining of a consent decree to pay a small fine, which in itself becomes nothing more than the payment of a small license fee.

Mr. President, I am surprised that the Senator from Tennessee would argue this one item as if there was nothing else in the bill affecting the Federal Trade Commission. There are other items as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has stated. There is the item of increase of more than \$40,000 to bring businessmen to Washington to confer as to what shall be done with respect to peat, candy manufacturing, tie fabrics,

venetian blinds, and parking meters, and so forth.

Surely, Mr. President, with \$40,000 businessmen could be brought here to stay a few days and confer. When they return to their homes the Commission does as it pleases. It pays no heed to them. The businessmen go back home thinking that they had something to do with the question of fair-trade practices. Such conferences are only window dressing.

Mr. President, this country is at war. Let me say to the Senate and to the people that the appropriations of \$60,600,000,000 for armament and supplies do not cover a single item for the fighting of the war in Korea. That expense will be presented in supplemental bills.

It has been said that we must cut deeper into civilian appropriations. Let me say today upon the floor of the Senate that the way to make a start is to cut a dollar here and a dollar there, to cut, for example, a few dollars off the White House appropriation, as we did today, representing things which are not needed. When we come to the appropriations totaling \$60,600,000,000, and to the supplemental bills for furnishing arms to the men who are fighting in Korea, it will be more dangerous to cut such items than to cut the item for \$40,000 for conferences of businessmen who come to Washington to talk about tie fabrics and parking meters.

If we do not start now we shall be unable to make any start at all. We shall come to the last bill, which will be the defense bill, and then discover that we have not cut the budget at all. What are we going to do? We are going to raise taxes. We are going to take more money from the people. If we want to go to socialism, or if we want to go back to the days of feudalism, let us increase taxes more and more, and put the Government into business. Once we do that, we are going back to feudalism. Why do I say that? I say it for the reason that, to the Senator from Michigan, communism, socialism, and feudalism are one and the same thing. Why? Because in the old feudal days the lord of the manor, the man who had charge of everything, had control, first, of the political system; secondly, he had control of the military system; and, third, he had charge of the entire economic system. That was feudalism.

When this Republic was formed and free enterprise was established in the world, the economic system was taken away from the control of the feudal lord. He had only two things left, namely, the political system and the military system. The only way he could derive any income to operate those two systems was by taxation, by taking from the economic system a royalty or tax.

From time to time he increased the amount of taxes, but it became increasingly difficult every year for him to get more taxes out of the people. Now there is a desire in some quarters to go back to the feudal system and to have the Government own and operate not only the political system and the military system, but the economic system as well.

Therefore, I say that today we are on the way back to feudalism. It is called

liberalism, as though it were a move in a new direction. It is on the road back to feudalism, and not forward. That is why we must reduce every one of these budgets, so that we may reduce the amount of taxes to meet unnecessary expenditures. We should not levy tribute upon the economic system for one dollar which is not absolutely necessary to operate the political and military systems and the necessary functions of Government. So I hope that we shall not be confused.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have listened with a great deal of interest and approval to what the Senator has said about the drift toward feudalism and socialism. However, I am wondering whether that is altogether applicable, when we are discussing the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission, the whole purpose of which is to prevent the concentration of economic power, to prevent the building up of monopoly, to prevent the drift toward feudalism, and to help maintain the independent, competitive system. I am ready to agree that undoubtedly the Commission can struggle through the next fiscal year with what the committee has recommended. I have just been making a little computation, and I find that the restoration, or partial restoration, which was made by the Senate committee of the cut made by the House, when subjected to the 10-percent cut which the Senate adopted the other day, reduces the increase to about \$97,000. So if the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee were adopted, the net effect would be practically to restore the exact figure which the Senate committee had recommended.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. It would reduce the amount to \$3,989,130.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the restoration were made, I think it would help the Federal Trade Commission in its efforts to prevent mergers and to develop stronger support for the free competitive system, to which we are all loyal.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that it is the province of this particular agency to regulate and investigate, toward the end that we may have a free-enterprise system, that we may have competition, that we may prevent monopoly. But when taxes are raised, and there is an increase of a dollar here, and a dollar in the next budget—and when I speak of dollars, I really mean millions or thousands of dollars—the tendency of the whole system is toward monopoly in the Federal Government.

The higher we raise taxes, the nearer we come to the feudal system, because we are concentrating the power of government over the economic system. We finally reach the point where taxes are so high that the people cannot afford to operate the economic system. So long as we keep taxes reasonable, we can maintain and develop the free individual economic system. But when we go too far in the collection of taxes and force upon the people the will of government in the operation of the eco-

nomic system, we come nearer every day to the old feudal system. In the days ahead we shall call it socialism; and after calling it socialism for a while, we shall find that the dictators will become stronger and more powerful. The system will then be known as communism, with the red flag as the real dictator, under a small group of those who have the economic and military power to enforce the taking and retention of the whole economic system.

So let us not be fooled here today. We are not voting for or against monopoly. We are voting for or against higher taxes. We are voting on the question of the operation of the Government on a sane and sound basis.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee, I can appreciate the efforts being made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to increase the appropriation. Some 2 years ago he offered an amendment, in which I joined him, to increase the appropriation for the Commission. It was at the time when the Senate was meeting in the old Supreme Court Chamber. I am not here to condemn the Commission. I think it has done some good. It is true that perhaps they have created some discord here and there. That sometimes happens as a result of the activities of a Government agency. I merely wish the RECORD to show that as chairman of the subcommittee I oppose the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee because it would increase the expenditures of the Commission. I shall likewise oppose the amendment being offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to reduce the appropriation by some \$917,000. Unfortunately, I am placed in the middle, but I shall have to oppose both amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator that the Kefauver amendment should be defeated. I will say to the Senator, so there will be no misunderstanding, that if the Kefauver amendment is defeated, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and I shall not offer the amendment to reduce further the appropriation of the Federal Trade Commission. We shall let the figure stand as reported by the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate what the Senator from New Hampshire has stated. He, the Senator from Michigan, and the Senator from Nebraska are members of the subcommittee. They will bear out my statement that the committee has labored long and hard in an effort to reduce the appropriation by \$614,000,000 below the budget request. The budget request was considerably lower than last year because of the cut that has been made in stockpiling and in the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration.

However, I remind the Senate, and I ask the particular attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], that the appropriation for the Veterans' Ad-

ministration in the pending bill is \$3,969,000,000, which is 63 percent of the total amount contained in the bill.

I wish the Senate to know that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will shortly report the armed services bill, carrying an appropriation of approximately \$62,000,000. That bill does not take into consideration the cost of the Korean war, which fact was testified to by Mr. Lovett on the first day of the hearings in the caucus room. Whatever expense is incurred as a result of the Korean war must be taken care of by future legislation. The appropriation of \$3,969,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration does not take into consideration the expenditure of one dime to any veteran of the Korean war. It does not cover one veteran of the Korean war or of any future war. The veteran of the Korean war does not enjoy the benefits of the GI bill of rights or any of the educational advantages such as are enjoyed by veterans of World War II.

I know the Senate will do what is necessary and I am very fearful that it will be necessary before the year is out to restore the cuts being made in the Veterans' Administration appropriation to take care of the boys who are crippled, or maimed and to make the other necessary provisions for the veterans of the Korean war, similar to the provisions which were made for the veterans of World War II. I wish the RECORD to show that fact, because there will be a deficiency appropriation bill for the Veterans' Administration, to take care of a Korean veterans' GI bill, for example, and to take care of whatever else it may become necessary to provide for. I shall be among the first to sponsor such legislation. However, I do not want to have the idea go abroad that the \$3,969,000,000 appropriation for the Veterans' Administration includes one cent for any veterans of the Korean war. I wish that fact to appear clearly in the RECORD.

I am glad to hear that the Senator from New Hampshire will withdraw his amendment, and I regret that I shall have to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The reason for withdrawing the amendment is that the subject will be taken up in conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to speak in reference to the argument which was made a few moments ago by the distinguished minority leader pertaining to the incompetency, inefficiency, and irregularities in the Federal Trade Commission.

As I listened to the debate my mind was refreshed by the thought that only about a year ago in the Senate we debated quite extensively the whole subject of the reorganization of the Federal Trade Commission pursuant to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and the reorganization proposal of the President of the United States.

The Senator from Nebraska quoted extensively from a report known as

"Antitrust Law Enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice." I have before me a copy of the report. It is my intention to quote from it, since as long as the Senator from Nebraska felt that the report was so persuasive and so compelling. Before I do so I wish to make a few observations. I refer particularly to Reorganization Plan No. 8, which pertained to the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad that the Senator is referring to the investigation of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was referring to the Federal Trade Commission, not the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thought the Senator said Veterans' Administration. I had the pleasure of reading the report which the Senator submitted on the investigation of the Veterans' Administration. We shall have to go further into appropriations when we take into consideration the Korean casualties and the question of what must be provided by way of education, and so forth, for veterans of the Korean war, or police action, or whatever one may wish to call it. I thought the Senator would address himself also to the Veterans' Administration. I have asked him how long he expects to talk, because I should like to return to the committee for a short time. I regret that I shall not be able to remain on the floor to hear his remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am confining myself to the Federal Trade Commission. I am interested in what the Senator from South Carolina said about the Veterans' Administration. That is why I wish to be on the floor when the bill is discussed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When charges are made on the floor of the Senate as to the inadequacy or inefficiency of regulatory bodies, it is a serious matter. I would say that if the words of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] were to be accepted at face value it would indicate that, instead of appropriating as much as the committee recommends, we should appropriate much less. In other words, if the Federal Trade Commission is as bad as has been portrayed, surely it does not merit the confidence of the representatives of the people.

However, Mr. President, I would invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that we did debate the subject of reorganization of this very administrative agency on May 22, 1950. We debated it extensively. In fact, the RECORD reveals at least 25 to 30 pages of debate. Senators who participated in the debate were the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BEN-
TON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and other Senators. The issue of the inadequacy and inefficiency of the Federal Trade Commission was gone into. There were those of us who believed in reorganization. We recognized the fact that there were

some shortcomings and debated the desirability of reorganizing the Federal Trade Commission.

Frankly, Mr. President, the reorganization proposal carried, even though by only a scant three votes. The Federal Trade Commission was reorganized by a majority of only three votes. Who were the Senators who opposed the reorganization? It is strange to note that the very Senators who opposed the reorganization of the Federal Trade Commission, so that the Chairman of the Commission could have control over the administrative functions, and so that the Chairman of the Commission could do away with the petty bickering and the unnecessary paper work which was consuming the time of employees, as was referred to by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], are the ones who today are criticizing this agency. Let me read from the RECORD, Mr. President. I have before me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated May 22. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 6, page 7375. Mr. President, a yea-and-nay vote was had on that day. The vote was on the issue of whether or not the Senate should approve or disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 8.

It so happens that the resolution on this plan was reported to the Senate as a resolution of disapproval. So when I read from the RECORD, I wish to have it noted that those who voted for reorganization were those who voted against the resolution disapproving the reorganization.

I shall read now the names of some of those who voted to disapprove the reorganization plan. I read from the RECORD the names of those who felt that the Federal Trade Commission should not be reorganized, despite the report which came from the House of Representatives and the report which came from a Senate committee. As I look down the list, I see the following, for example: The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and others as listed in the roll call.

Let me come to the concluding part: I notice also that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] voted against the program to reorganize the Federal Trade Commission.

I simply say to the distinguished minority leader that if inadequacy and inefficiency are present in the Federal Trade Commission, as the Senator now says a year later, at least he did not make that clear on May 22, 1950, when we needed his vote in order to revitalize and reorganize the Federal Trade Commission. Where was the minority leader then? He was in opposition to a proposal which would have made possible better administrative control and procedure in the Federal Trade Commission. He voted against a proposal which would have given the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission the opportunity and the responsibility to properly organize the administrative structure of the Commission. In other words, the Senator

from Nebraska voted to keep inefficiency in the Federal Trade Commission. He voted to keep on the auditors that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was talking about. The Senator from Nebraska voted to deny the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission the opportunity to operate that Commission smoothly and to organize it on an efficient basis.

Thank goodness, Mr. President, we carried the day for economy in government; thank goodness we carried the day for efficiency in government, despite the protest of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Now let us consider how much money the Federal Trade Commission has had. Let us examine the House report about which I have heard so much said. I heard the Senator from Nebraska ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who has given wonderful leadership in this body on the entire issue of antimonopoly legislation and protection of small business, "Do you agree with Representative PATMAN of Texas?"

The Senator from Louisiana was not given the courtesy of being permitted to answer the question then, but I think it is fair for me to interpolate the expression of the Senator from Louisiana, namely, that he recognized in Representative PATMAN, of Texas, one of the vigorous champions of small business and competitive enterprise in the United States.

Mr. President, I have before me the preliminary report of the House Committee on Small Business. Let me say that one of the practices engaged in in the course of debate is to quote only partially from a record. I wish to have certain pages of the committee report printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and I shall so request a little later. However, at this time I read from page 40 of the report:

VII. THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION—APPROPRIATIONS AND PERSONNEL
RECENT APPROPRIATION HISTORY OF THE COMMISSION

Figure 7 indicates the total appropriations granted the Federal Trade Commission since 1915 and also the number of employees on June 30 of each year. It will be noted that although the general trend of appropriations has been upward, the increase has not kept pace with the rising cost of operations. With the exception of a brief period in 1941 the Commission had a larger staff in 1918 than at any time since.

Mr. President, let me digress from the report long enough to say that, as stated in the report, the Federal Trade Commission had a larger staff in 1918 than it had in any other year except 1941. I shall ask any Member of this body whether monopolistic enterprise has grown stronger in the United States since 1918. Has there been more concentration of economic power, has there been a greater threat to small business, and have more small businesses perished since 1918 than before that time? I think the record speaks for itself.

Today we hear talk about competition. Mr. President, there is no competition in putting Joe Louis in his prime in a

ring in Madison Square Garden with a high-school freshman. That is not competition; for the high-school freshman it is suicide. When the Senator from Nebraska talks about trying to preserve competition between the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana and a small filling-station operator, that is not competition; and when he refers to competition in that case, he is merely indulging in a play on words. It is not competition, Mr. President; it is the economic and political murder of an independent business institution.

I return to the committee report, and I read now from page 41; I read the next paragraph, and I do not skip a line, nor do I read out of context:

During the last 15 years, the funds available to the Commission—

The Federal Trade Commission—reached their low point in 1937, when \$1,939,000 was appropriated. A slight increase then occurred which in 1942 raised the appropriation to the then maximum of \$2,434,000. The war years saw some diminution, and in 1945 \$2,059,000 was appropriated. Since then, a slow but steady increase has occurred, with \$3,723,000 appropriated in 1950 and \$3,892,000 in 1951.

Now I read the next paragraph:

During the 15 years from 1936 to 1950 the number of employees reached its year-end peak in 1941 at 694.

Mr. President, I stress the point that there were only 694 employees of the Federal Trade Commission, to supervise and enforce the Clayton Antitrust Act, to supervise and enforce the Robinson-Patman Act. There were only 694 employees to protect thousands upon thousands of small-business institutions and enterprises in the United States. Yet there are those who would say that that number of employees is an exorbitant one.

I read further from the report:

There was a substantial reduction in staff during the war years from which only a partial recovery has been made up to the present time. At the end of fiscal 1950, 654 persons were employed at the Commission. In spite of the increase in appropriations this was slightly less than the number of employees just prior to the war.

Mr. President, is there anyone in the entire country—not just in the United States Senate, but the entire United States—who does not know that during the war years big business grew and grew—bigger and bigger? Is there anyone who does not know that since the war years the threat of big business to little business has been an increasing threat? Yet, what has Congress been doing for the Federal Trade Commission, to protect those who believe in free enterprise, to give small-business men a chance to live? Do you know, Mr. President, what Congress has been doing in that connection? Congress has been cutting down the size of the police force to be used for that work. As these corporate economic barons have marched up and down the American economic landscape, the Congress of the United States has said to the Federal Trade Commission, "You can get along with a few less policemen." So, Mr. President, the bigger big business got, the fewer

law-enforcement officers Congress provided.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who has done such an admirable and history-making job in connection with the investigation of crime, knows that, basically, two things are needed: One is the integrity and the will to enforce the law; the second thing is the necessary manpower.

However, the Senator from Nebraska is opposed, first, to the will to enforce the law; the Federal Trade Commission has enforced certain laws which the Senator from Nebraska thinks should not be enforced. In the second place, the Senator from Nebraska objects to giving the Federal Trade Commission more manpower with which to do the job of enforcement.

Let me continue to quote from the committee report; and I point out that I read without skipping any portion of it; I read the report as it is printed:

Of the Commission's total expenditures of \$3,723,000 in 1950, \$2,503,000, or about two-thirds, was devoted to legal case work. Slightly more than half of the funds available for case work are allotted to actions against monopoly and restraint of trade. Of the funds devoted to activities not involving case work the largest item is the administration of the Wool Act. In 1950 the sum of \$311,000 (as expenditures are presently classified) was allocated to this activity. Economic and financial reports were allotted \$234,000, and trade practice conferences were granted \$211,000. None of the above figures include administrative salaries. (See pt. III, exhibit 8, for additional data.)

I continue the quotation from the report:

INCREASING COST OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACTIONS

One of the striking developments of recent years in the operations of the Federal Trade Commission is the rapidly increasing cost of taking effective action to correct violations of the law.

It is to be expected, of course, that costs would be affected by the general increase in prices and salaries. It is equally clear that the increase in appropriations in recent years, although substantial, has not kept pace with rising costs. It would be expected, therefore, that some diminution would occur in the number of corrective actions. Nevertheless, the decline in these actions is too great to be explained solely in terms of the increase in costs of operations.

I read the good, and I read the bad. Now, Mr. President, turning to page 44, it says:

The committee fully realizes that the effectiveness of the Commission's orders and stipulations cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. Nevertheless, we believe we have here a symptom of a basic problem confronting the present Commission; namely, that of exercising sufficient administrative control over its staff to hold them to the highest level of operating efficiency. We suggest that serious study be given this matter of increasing internal costs by the Commission itself, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Congress.

That paragraph relates to the problem which I cited earlier, the administrative difficulties. Here is a House committee which takes note of the fact that one of the reasons for the increasing costs in the Commission's activity is the lack of administrative efficiency. But I

point out again that some of that has already been rectified by the passage of Reorganization Plan No. 8. I point even more vociferously and more directly that the Senator from Nebraska, the minority leader, voted against reorganization, and voted for inefficiency and inadequacy in the Federal Trade Commission activities.

Let us now read the next paragraph appearing on page 44:

THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS

The need for larger appropriations to finance our business-regulating programs has been repeatedly pointed out. The committee believes that more and better men, and hence more money, are basic to the necessary enhancement of the effectiveness of the antitrust laws. We are convinced that this is true of the Federal Trade Commission as well as of other agencies.

On June 30, 1950, the Federal Trade Commission had only 98 attorneys engaged in enforcing the antimonopoly provisions of the Federal Trade Commission and Clayton Acts.

Mr. President, the Federal Trade Commission of the United States of America had 98 attorneys for all of its numerous activities in the protection of small-business enterprise and free competition in this country. I read further:

In one case before the Commission at the time this was being written, the respondents were represented by 102 separate law firms.

In one case, Mr. President, the Federal Trade Commission, as it prosecuted a case against an alleged violator of the Clayton antitrust law, found that that violator, or alleged violator, had 102 law firms to support the respondent, or the violator; and this is not unusual. I learned in committees of the Congress when we were looking into the Interstate Commerce Commission, particularly into the railway mail pay case, that the Post Office Department, with 2 attorneys was contending against 45 railroad attorneys, and apparently there are those who would have them staffed with even less than 2 attorneys.

I submit that our duty is to protect the public interest, and it is impossible to protect the public interest against the powerful economic forces of the country with but a handful of attorneys, good as they may be, because there can be so many diversionary actions going on around the countryside that there is no possible way that the Federal Trade Commission can win its struggles.

I have heard about the number of years required for cases before the Commission to come to a head. With 98 attorneys in the Federal Trade Commission, it is a wonder to me that they ever get one case to a decision, particularly when every one of those attorneys is confronted with from 50 to 100 attorneys on the opposite side of the case, depending upon the size of the case or the size of the firm. Let me quote further:

To meet this force of legal talent the Commission had the services of one principal attorney and two part-time assistants.

The Federal Trade Commission had one principal attorney and two part-time assistants. I read further:

For every dollar spent by the public in defending itself against monopoly the respondents spend thousands.

This is what the House committee report says:

Under the circumstances it is to be expected that only the surface of the problem of unfair competition is being scratched.

Ah, Mr. President, there is a very key sentence. Is it any wonder that monopoly grows stronger? Is it any wonder that we have continuous pressure upon us by the steel companies, and by the Cement Institute, of which the Senator from Louisiana has spoken today? Why does that happen? Because the public stands helpless before the legal and economic power and subtlety of those who want special privilege.

Mr. President, this House report is a very interesting one. It has a great deal more in it than the Senator from Nebraska quoted. When the Representative from Texas was unhappy about certain things in the Federal Trade Commission, this report tells a revealing story, and it tells the story that we have not kept pace with the threat which exists against our economic system, that our regulatory bodies have not been given the staffs they need in order to protect the public interest.

Of course there must be economy. One way to achieve economy in the Congress is merely to abolish the agency. That would save about \$3,989,130 this year, but in the process of doing it, Mr. President, there would be abolished not only an agency, but there would be abolished, liquidated, and obliterated great sections of American free enterprise.

I have noticed an interesting overtone in the comment today. I have noticed that this attack on the Federal Trade Commission has little or nothing to do with this appropriation. I have noticed that this is the continuation of an attack against the very purpose of the Federal Trade Commission and against the basic law which it administers. When I heard the Senator from Nebraska attack the rulings of the Federal Trade Commission, what was he saying? He was saying that they were not administering the law as he thought they ought to administer it. He referred continuously to a bill, Senate bill 1008, known as the basing-point bill. This bill was opposed on this floor by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators. I was privileged to be a partner in that effort. The bill passed the Senate over our opposition. It passed the House, but the President of the United States, exactly as he did with several other measures adversely affecting the consuming public, the American people, vetoed the bill.

The minority leader may not like what the President does. I have gathered during the 2½ years I have been here that there has been a mild element of disagreement between the minority leader and the President. But, Mr. President, before a bill becomes law, the President must sign it, and it is no law until the President signs it, and it has no binding jurisdiction upon a committee of the House or upon an administrative agency. If the Federal Trade

Commission administered the law on the basis of what a Senate vote was, or a House vote, without a Presidential signature, then the Federal Trade Commission would be in violation of the law, and would be in violation of the oath of its members to uphold the law of the land.

Mr. President, what is behind this struggle? What is behind the attack made here today? I will tell the Senate what is behind it. This is but part and parcel of an attack upon the Robinson-Patman Act, part and parcel of an attack upon the Clayton Antitrust Act. It is a part of a program which has been launched, a program which was brought to our attention last year in the basing-point bill, a program which has been known by those who believe in small business enterprise as directed to the disadvantage of the man who truly believes in free competition with rules of fair play.

The Senator from Nebraska says he is not going to ask for any further reduction in this bill, he simply is not going to support an amendment which is offered by the Senator from Tennessee. What is the purpose of the amendment? The purpose of the amendment is to provide an administrative legal staff so that a glaring loophole in the Clayton antitrust law may be plugged. That is what it amounts to. The purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is to provide a staff so that the bill which the Congress passed to prevent mergers of corporate enterprises detrimental to the public interests, and which is now the law of the land, may be properly administered. To deny an adequate staff is to undermine the administration of the act. To deny to the Federal Trade Commission a legal staff needed to carry out the mandate of the law is to kill the intent and purpose of the law. The law is no better than its administration. It does little or no good to pass a law unless there is available the administrative personnel to enforce it.

Mr. President, let me pay the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] a tribute. He has been on the floor every time there has come up an issue pertaining to monopoly. He has been a defender of the people. Just as he fearlessly exposed the hoodlums and racketeers, so he is now willing to stand up and expose those who would kill the last vestige of free enterprise in this country. I know of no Member of the Congress who has performed a more valiant and vigilant service than has the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] knows the basing-point problem and what is behind it as do few Members of this body or of any other body.

Those of us who are in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee realize the difficulty of our task. But it is time to sound warnings, and I now join with the Senator from Louisiana in saying that if the attack on the Federal Trade Commission is sustained, if it is permitted to go unchallenged, we can write off the Federal Trade Commission as another casualty

of special privilege and special interest. The small-business man can write off his future. I think the time has come when those who believe in these things should stand up and fight. We have too often let some arguments pass unchallenged. That day is over, so far as I am concerned. Every time a Senator rises to emasculate one of these agencies, he will be in for a fight on the floor of the Senate, or off the floor, on the basis of the issue. I have watched certain laws being emasculated, point by point, because those who believe in them find themselves too preoccupied with many duties.

So, today, Mr. President, I have the record, and it is on the side of the Senator from Tennessee, it is on the side of the Senator from Louisiana, and it is not on the side of the argument made only a few moments ago by the minority leader.

I join with the minority leader in promoting efficiency in government. If he can show me an employee who is not doing his duty, I will say that employee should be fired. If he can show me that there is malingering going on, it should be corrected, and I shall support him in correcting it. But to find one junior clerk who is not doing his job is not enough to convince me that we should drastically reduce appropriations for an entire agency and thereby limit its effectiveness.

The distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], in a speech appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 6, page 7371, said:

How much money do these commissions handle in their budgets?

He was talking about regulatory commissions.

How much money does it take to operate them? The ICC, which is the largest, costs the Government \$12,000,000 a year. The Federal Communications Commission costs \$7,000,000. The Federal Trade Commission, the one we are now considering, costs \$4,000,000, and the Federal Power Commission costs \$4,000,000. The total for the four commissions is \$27,000,000.

How great a percentage is that of the total expenditures for this year? It is sixty-five one-thousandths of one percent. That is a pretty small amount.

Mr. President, to regulate the private utilities of the United States, to prevent certain persons from being able to exploit the market, to regulate the railroads, to regulate the monopolies, and to regulate the system of radio and television communications costs sixty-five one-thousandths of one percent of the budget. Is that exorbitant? Is this small sum threatening the economic solvency of the Government? To my mind, never has so little produced so much in the interests of the people.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to remind the Senator that in the allocations and in the appropriations for NPA and OPS there will be more than sixty-five one-thousandths of one percent, because they are asking for a great deal of money. They want to take over all the regulatory bodies of the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am happy the Senator from South Carolina has brought that to my attention, because I believe we must maintain the so-called independent agencies of the Government. All I wish to point out is that we have witnessed on the floor of the Senate not an attack upon an appropriation, but an attack against the philosophy of the regulation of monopolies and trusts. We have heard some complaints because the President vetoed Senate bill 1008. We have heard voices raised to the heavens about the poor competitive position of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana. I am going to cry my eyes out about that. I want the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana to have a fair break, but that is all. I want any large concern to have a fair break in the economic arena, but that is all. I do not want them to have the privilege of breaking other persons or monopolizing the market. That is what will happen if we tear down the Federal Trade Commission.

Before there are any further economy moves, I suggest that there be brought before the Congress of the United States evidence to indicate that the commission is overstaffed, that its job is less than it used to be. If those facts are established, I shall vote for any cut that anyone wants. But until that is done, I am suspicious of those who would cut into the lifeline of these regulatory bodies.

Two practices go on here. Either we destroy an agency by cutting off its appropriation or the agency is obliterated by the kind of appointments and internal arrangements that affect the enforcement of the law. I have some criticism of certain agencies, but my criticism is not that they are doing too much in terms of regulation. My criticism is that they lose the will to regulate, primarily because they hear certain critical voices in the Congress.

I tell my friends of the Federal Trade Commission, "Do not be moved by the voices you have heard on only one side of the aisle. Do not become too disturbed about what the minority leader said, because he is the minority leader, not the majority leader." But I remind the Federal Trade Commission that the law of the land still requires the enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act, the Clayton Act, and of laws pertaining to free economic enterprise, so as not to permit the giants of economic power to stalk up and down the land and browbeat the small-business enterprises of America. Within the framework of the law the only way laws will be effective is through enforcement. The only way we can have enforcement is through the employment of competent trained personnel who cannot and will not be intimidated.

Talk about lobbies, Mr. President. We are lobbying these agencies all the time by our debate. No member of the Federal Trade Commission has ever lobbied me. Maybe I should feel badly because I have been omitted. But the minority leader seems to find all kinds of lobbying going on. The Senator from Louisiana said he had not been lobbied. The Senator from Tennessee said that in order to get any action he had to make a personal

request. I have not been lobbied. The minority leader is the only one who has had the privilege of being lobbied.

I desire to make it quite clear that there is no agency of the Government that should be intimidated by the talk, the insinuations, or the comments of any Member of the Congress. The separation of powers means just exactly what it says.

One of the things that is happening in America is that too many voices are being stilled, too many voices that should speak out for the American people are being hushed, and they are being hushed because some voices are saying to others, "Be quiet." As one United States Senator I will say my voice will not be hushed nor will I discontinue my efforts to support effective regulation of monopolistic enterprise. I shall speak out for human welfare.

I say to the Federal Trade Commission, "Your only weakness is that you are not doing enough. You ought to be prosecuting cases with more determination and perseverance." I say to the Federal Trade Commission, "If you knuckle down and bow down to the kind of talk that has been heard on the floor of the Senate and the House about the Standard Oil case or any other case, you are not fulfilling your obligations under the law."

The law on this subject still stands on the side of the independent entrepreneur. The law on this subject is still written so that competition must be in good faith without discrimination. That is the law that must be preserved.

So I ask, Mr. President, that as we vote on this measure we consider what the true issue is. The true issue is not whether we are going to save \$3,000 or \$30,000. The true issue is whether we are going to save small enterprise; to keep big business from becoming bigger and little business from becoming fewer and fewer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am tremendously in favor of the Federal Trade Commission. The chairman of that Commission was long a Member of this body, and served with most of those who are now Members of the Senate. He is James M. Mead, formerly Senator from New York. He is a grand man, a straightforward man, in every way a worthy man. So far as I know all the other members of the Commission are fine men, and I should like to help them. I want to do everything possible to help the Commission do its real work; not to take over the work of other agencies, but to do its own work. As I said, I know of no commission in the Government to which I would rather be fair and just than this commission.

Mr. President, the committee went carefully over the items for the Federal Trade Commission all the way through and increased the appropriation over that for last year by some ninety-seven thousand dollars. Is that being unfair to a commission? Is that being unjust to a commission? It is not at all unfair or unjust. We increased the amount appropriated for the Commission instead of decreasing it. But the Commission wants to take over the work of other agencies, which the Commission has no legal right to do at all. Our committee did not permit that. Should our com-

mittee be condemned for doing the fair thing by the Commission? It certainly should not be. I doubt if there is a member of the committee on either side who does not feel the utmost interest in the Federal Trade Commission. The Commission can be of wonderful advantage to all the people of the country, and ought to be sustained in every proper and just way.

Mr. President, I am sorry the junior Senator from Nebraska is not now present on the Senate floor. I was very truly surprised to hear him speak as he did about lobbyists. I believe there is only one lobbyist I ever knew by sight, and he came before our committee because he was summoned by me to appear before it. He is one whose name I do not need to give. Senators all know him. I do not believe I know any other single lobbyist among what I am told are several thousand in Washington.

Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators to a general provision of law enacted in an appropriation bill several years ago. I hope every Member of the Senate present on the floor will listen to the reading of this law, and that Senators who are not present will read it. I am reading from section 6, chapter 6, of the legislative appropriation act passed in the Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, in 1919. This is legislation on an appropriation bill, if you please, but no one objected to it, apparently. It is still the law, and it has never been repealed:

SEC. 6. That hereafter no part of the money appropriated by this or any other act—

Making it legislation—

shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Any officer or employee of the United States—

Listen to this, Senators—

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

I should like to say to my friend from Nebraska that he must be wholly mistaken as to any lobbyist having anything to do with the pending bill. I wish to say for myself and for the members of the committee that I am sure no lobbyists have been before us. I cannot imagine why the question of lobbying

with Senators or Representatives should be brought into the debate in the face of the law I have just read. While that language is contained in an appropriation bill, while it is legislation on an appropriation bill—the words “this or any other act” make it legislation—in view of that provision I am sure that no lobbyist from any department comes to the Capitol to lobby. If anyone did so he should be removed from office. I am sure the Senator from Nebraska simply made a mistake on that point. I wanted the Senate to know what the law was.

As I said before, the members of the Appropriations Committee—and with the exception of myself, it is composed of the finest men I ever saw, men of great acumen and ability—have gone over this question for several days; they have heard the proof; they have looked at the subject from the standpoint of the Government and the standpoint of the people, and have reported the bill which is now before the Senate. It may be that we increased the amount of the appropriation a little too much, though I hope not. But we have tried to be fair and just about the matter. I hope the Senate will sustain the committee. I will say for the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], that, as all Senators know, he is one of the most high-minded and conscientious men in the Senate. No man has ever done a finer job of handling a bill than has my distinguished friend from South Carolina; and he ought to be upheld by every Democrat.

What are committees for, if they are not to look into various subjects and submit proper recommendations?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I greatly appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has said with reference to me. Whatever good I may have accomplished has resulted because the chairman of the committee appointed me chairman of the subcommittee and told me to do what was right.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot claim the credit. I say that we ought to stand by the Senator from South Carolina and his subcommittee. We ought to stand by the Appropriations Committee. We ought not to be misled into voting for this amendment. I hope that it will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The amendment was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, on Friday I asked unanimous consent to have a call of the calendar for uncontested bills. At that time I thought that we would complete consideration of the appropriation bill today. I do not like to interrupt the handling of the appropriation bill by a call of the calendar; so I ask unanimous consent that the order which was obtained last Friday, to call the calendar tomorrow, be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is it the Senator's plan to consider bills on the calendar at the conclusion of the pending appropriation bill?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes. I was just about to give notice—

Mr. MAYBANK. Reserving the right to object, I hope this bill will be concluded tomorrow; but if the bill is not concluded tomorrow, the Senate already has a unanimous-consent agreement to bring up the defense production bill. I merely call it to the attention of the majority leader.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I am unable to state when, but at least shortly after the disposition of the pending bill, it is our intention to call the calendar. I am hopeful that we can do so at an early time, but I ask unanimous consent that the other unanimous-consent agreement be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I had understood that a part of the previous unanimous-consent agreement related to putting into statutory form the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case. Does that agreement stand vacated, too?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that it was not the subject of a unanimous-consent agreement. I merely gave notice that after the disposition of the appropriation bill, and after the call of the calendar, it was our intention to bring up the bill to which the Senator refers, with the understanding that it might be temporarily laid aside for the control bill, or any appropriation bill which may be ready.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it still the intention of the majority leader to bring up that bill following the call of the calendar?

Mr. MCFARLAND. The Senator is correct; unless the control bill is ready.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader knows that that bill is one which many of us believe would make very important changes in the administration of the antitrust laws. Responsible small-business organizations have been asking for a hearing on the bill. So have members of the Judiciary Committee. The bill has been heretofore reported without any hearings whatsoever on behalf of small-business concerns.

There are many persons who would like to present their protest against the proposed legislation, and possibly attempt to reason with the committee and agree upon amendments to the bill.

I wonder if the Senator feels that so important a measure should be considered without giving those who wish to be

heard an opportunity to present their side at appropriate hearings.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I will say to my distinguished friend from Louisiana that I had understood that he would probably oppose the bill; but I did not feel that I should be the judge as to whether or not it should be considered. The bill was reported by a committee. It has been on the calendar for some time. I felt that it was our duty to give it the right-of-way. I do not believe that we should bury legislation merely by not bringing it up.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I certainly wish the Senator from Arizona would do what in my opinion he has the power to do, namely, to see that we have an opportunity for a hearing. Independent retail and wholesale associations would like to be heard.

Mr. MCFARLAND. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is present in the Chamber. If the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will address his remarks to the chairman, perhaps he can persuade him. Or does the Senator feel that I would have more persuasive ability? I do not think so.

Mr. LONG. Some time ago the junior Senator from Louisiana suggested to the chairman that he would like to see hearings held on the bill, so that many of us might have an opportunity to present our views and to hear the viewpoint of those supporting the proposed legislation before the committee. My request had very little effect upon the chairman of the committee. I thought the distinguished majority leader might be able to help me.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I thank the Senator for the compliment.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MCCARRAN. The presentation of this matter was made by the most eminent body in the world. Its answer has been handed down, and is now of record. The bill carries only the language of the Supreme Court of the United States, handed down after the matter had been fully presented to that tribunal.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Many of us believe that this bill, particularly with the committee report which accompanies it, would have the effect of requiring an interpretation of the law far beyond what the Supreme Court held in the case of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, and would have the effect of extending what we believe to be a bad doctrine, and one contrary to previous decisions of the Court.

The junior Senator from Louisiana believes that this matter should be the subject of hearings. He believes that the case of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana probably makes necessary legislation to give some protection to small business, which it would not otherwise have; therefore, he hopes that the chairman of the committee and the majority leader will consider doing what could be done

to see that we have appropriate hearings before final action is taken.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I inquire of the majority leader whether or not the calendar is to be called tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. No. I had made an announcement, before the Senator entered the Chamber, that the calendar would be called following the disposition of the pending bill, rather than to interrupt consideration of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Which bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. The appropriation bill. When I made the announcement on Friday, I thought we would finish consideration of the bill by this evening.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator was filled with optimism at that time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I believe in being optimistic.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An agreement was entered into Friday that the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations should be considered as agreed to en bloc, with the privilege reserved to any Senator to offer an amendment in the second degree without reconsideration. The amendments of the committee agreed to en bloc will be printed in the RECORD for the information of Senators.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it is not often that I ask for an increase in an appropriation, but I am asking for an increase of \$8,000 for the expenses of the Commission on the Renovation of the Executive Mansion. The provision which is found on page 12 of the bill, reads:

For all expenses of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion as authorized by Public Law 40, Eighty-first Congress, \$25,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is not the Commission composed chiefly of Members of the House and Members of the Senate? I understand that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is the head of the Senate representation on the Commission. I should like to inquire who is the head of the House membership.

Mr. McKELLAR. The membership has changed recently. It is Representative RABAU now. I do not think there will be any objection to the increase in the appropriation.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope there will not be. I shall be happy to take it to conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like respectfully to call the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to the fact that the Senator from Michigan felt quite strongly about it. The committee

increased the amount contained in the House bill by \$5,000 and gave the Commission 1 month more to operate. Now the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who is the chairman of the Commission, wishes to add \$8,000, and to take it to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Commission would have two more months to operate, in order to close out its affairs.

Mr. MAYBANK. Provided the conferees agreed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope they will agree.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the amendment will go to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$33,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to strike out "two passenger motor vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof "one passenger motor vehicle."

On page 5, lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to strike out "five hundred and seventy-six" and insert in lieu thereof "one hundred and forty-nine."

On page 5, lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to strike out "two hundred and twenty-nine" and insert in lieu thereof "one hundred and fourteen."

On page 15, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "twenty" and insert in lieu thereof "ten."

On page 15, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one."

On page 18, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

On page 23, lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to strike out "including the purchase of four passenger motor vehicles."

On page 28, line 24, strike out "twenty-four" and insert in lieu thereof "nine."

On page 31, line 2, strike out "eight" and insert in lieu thereof "four."

On page 36, lines 6, 7, and 8, strike out "not to exceed one hundred and ninety, of which one hundred and sixty-four shall be for replacement only" and insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed eighty-two, for replacement only."

On page 37, line 3, strike out "seventy-four" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty-seven."

On page 40, lines 16 and 17, strike out "including the purchase of one hundred

and ninety-eight passenger motor vehicles."

On page 46, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. 110. No part of any appropriation made in this title or title II of this act, except appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, shall be available for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle for replacement purposes unless each such passenger motor vehicle purchased replaces two passenger motor vehicles.

On page 48, line 11, strike out "five" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

On page 49, line 14, strike out "four" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

On page 61, line 10, strike out "seven" and insert in lieu thereof "three."

On page 64, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

SEC. 403. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by, any corporation or agency included in this title shall be used for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle for replacement purposes unless each such passenger motor vehicle purchased replaces two passenger motor vehicles.

On page 70, between lines 7 and 8, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 604. The appropriations or authorizations of the following agencies and corporations are hereby reduced by amounts equal to the cost of acquisition of the number of passenger motor vehicles indicated with respect to each such agency or corporation as follows: American Battle Monuments Commission, 1; Atomic Energy Commission, 427; Federal Communications Commission, 10; Federal Power Commission, 1; General Services Administration, 17; Interstate Commerce Commission, 15; National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, 4; Tennessee Valley Authority, 108; Veterans' Administration, 235; Department of Commerce, 5; and Public Housing Administration, 4.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Have the amendments been printed?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Because of the fact that the Senate recessed at 2 o'clock on Friday, it was not possible for me to get the amendments ready before that time, and therefore they have not been printed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no intention, as chairman of the subcommittee, of preventing the offering of any amendments. I could not do so even if I wished to do so. My thought is that something like 16 amendments will be offered. We have completed consideration of only one, I believe. The amendments which have been printed have been before Senators for their study. Over the week end I had an opportunity to study the printed amendments. I made a study of each one of the amendments. I would appreciate it if my good friend from Illinois would let his amendment go over until tomorrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would be glad to do so—

Mr. MAYBANK. Particularly if any amendment conflicts with amendments which have been printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We already agreed in principle on the question of automobiles when we dealt with the first appropriation bill. I had hoped that we could

dispose of the question of automobiles this afternoon. That is what is covered by the amendment I have just submitted.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in agreement with the Senator from Illinois on the question of automobiles, if it includes chauffeurs. I realize that the Senate recessed at 2 o'clock on Friday. Therefore, the Senator did not have time to have the amendments printed. We had to go to a committee meeting immediately after the Senate recessed. The Senator from Illinois was in attendance at the meeting in the writing of the control law. As chairman of the subcommittee it is impossible for me to study an amendment that is offered on the floor. We have 17 amendments before us, or will have 17 amendments before us. I believe we have 13 amendments remaining. If the Senator will bear with me, I will not make the point of order that the amendment has not been printed, but I would ask him to bring up only those amendments on which I have some information. I notice that one amendment to be offered by the Senator from Illinois would reduce the number of houses in the Housing Administration section of the bill to 37,000. Is that correct. Or is it 35,000 houses?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That amendment refers to a reduction in the appropriation for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration. It does not reduce the number of housing units. I shall not bring up that amendment this afternoon, but shall wait until tomorrow.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is an economist, and knows it would take Mr. COOPER and I a long time to study each item. We would have to do it until late at night.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the moment I am only bringing up the amendment to reduce the number of automobiles. I shall be glad to postpone the offering of the amendment on the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration until tomorrow. Perhaps some other amendments could also be brought up at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator can understand what I am confronted with in the case of amendments which involve millions of dollars, such as the amendments to the section relating to the Housing Administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would have preferred to have had the amendments printed on Friday. I was unable to do so because the Senate recessed very early. It was almost impossible to prepare the amendments in time. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] had the great advantage, being on the Committee on Appropriations, of knowing what the appropriations were going to be.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill was reported and any Senator could have seen what it contained, whether or not the Senator was on the committee. I gave the bill to the press about 10 days ago.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished minority leader, I should like to say that this is the second day we have spent in the consideration of the pending bill. We have not made much progress.

I should like very much to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement for a limitation of debate on amendments. If it is agreeable, I should like to suggest that 20 minutes be allowed to an amendment, with 10 minutes to a side. I believe we have 15 amendments. Even with a limitation it would take a long time to dispose of them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. WHERRY. Would the limitation start at noon tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to have it start now. If I may have the attention of the majority leader and the minority leader, as I understand, one of the amendments will be withdrawn. It affects the Civil Aeronautics Board, particularly with respect to the work at Langley Field, and involves construction. I understand it will be withdrawn. I do not know whether other amendments will be offered to that item. If it is a matter on which the House Armed Services Committee has acted and on which the House has acted, there will not be any amendments offered in the Senate. We have not recommended anything for construction. We must pay on so-called future agreements which have been made. The only construction item is the one in the Senate bill. If the amendment to which I have referred is withdrawn, less time will be required. An amendment which will call for considerable debate is the one relating to public housing. I believe that the Senator from Massachusetts will agree as to that.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that it will be perfectly agreeable to me to have the limitation on debate begin now. The sooner it begins the better, for I think the Senate must begin to make progress in handling the appropriation bills, and it seems that we do not make any progress on them unless we have a limitation of debate. So I should like to have the Senate begin now to limit debate, with 10 minutes allowed to each side, or 20 minutes altogether, on each amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe in progress, but I believe we had better provide for 30 minutes on each amendment, with 15 minutes to each side. Some amendments are somewhat more important than others. If that proposal is made, I think it will be satisfactory.

Let me say that when I was off the floor of the Senate, I was informed that request was made for unanimous consent to vacate the order for the calling of the calendar tomorrow. Let me inquire whether that is the case.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, it is.

Mr. WHERRY. As usual, Mr. President, several Senators told me that they were assured that the calendar would be called tomorrow, regardless of what other developments might occur, because the majority leader had stated specifically that if action on the pending bill was not completed today, it would be temporarily laid aside tomorrow, at which time the Senate would take up the calendar.

I shall agree to the proposal now made, but I shall do so with a great deal of

reluctance, because at least two Senators, who now have left the city, may be very much interested in votes which will be taken during the further consideration of this bill. However, in the interest of progress, I shall not object to the proposed agreement, and I shall be glad to have the Senator from Arizona at once make his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McFARLAND. How much time would the Senator like to have allowed for debate on the bill itself?

Mr. WHERRY. The amount of time is immaterial to me, but I think not more than 1 hour altogether or—30 minutes to each side—should be provided.

If there is to be any exception in regard to the time to be allowed for debate on the amendments, will it be in the case of the housing amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I intend to propose an allowance of 30 minutes for each side in that case.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I believe that half an hour in total will be sufficient in the case of the housing amendment, as well, for there are a number of amendments, including the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]; and if we total the time to be allowed on all those amendments, on the basis of 30 minutes on each one, I believe there will be ample time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My suggestion is that there be allowed for debate on the bill itself the same amount of time allowed for debate on any amendment. Certainly when we have completed action on the amendments, we shall know what we wish to do in regard to the bill itself. The only exception I would make to the proposal for a total of 30 minutes on each amendment would be in the case of the housing amendment, if the majority leader wishes to have such an exception made.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not believe that will be necessary. The ranking minority Member of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], agrees, I am sure, that we have fought out this matter in the committee, and there are at least 5 amendments which affect it.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that beginning immediately there be a limitation of debate, on all amendments, to 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], provided he is opposed to the amendment; or, if he favors the amendment, to be under the control of the distinguished minority leader; and that there be a limitation of 30 minutes on the bill, to be divided equally between the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the distinguished minority leader or any Senator whom he may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask a question either of the majority leader or of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], because I think it will bear very greatly upon the amount of debate on the specific amendments. Are we correctly informed that the so-called Ferguson amendment, making a deduction of 10 percent from the figures originally contained in the bill as reported by the committee, as they relate to the employment of personnel, has been incorporated in the bill as it is now being considered by the Senate?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Florida, for the Record, that the bill as originally reported by the committee called for a 5-percent reduction, in accordance with the proposal of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. Later, a further 5-percent reduction was reported by the committee, in accordance with the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

So the bill now before the Senate includes reductions of 10 percent, 5 percent of that being in accordance with the original Cordon amendment, and the other 5 percent being in accordance with the Ferguson amendment which was adopted by the Senate to the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill. I was authorized to report the bill with that amendment included in it. Therefore, the bill as reported includes amendments making total reductions of 10 percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator whether he has placed in the Record the specific figures as to the savings which thus will be accomplished.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did so on Friday; and on Friday the Senate adopted all the committee amendments, subject to the right to consider them again, later on. The total savings will amount to approximately \$14,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That amendment has been adopted, has it not?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. We adopted it, at the request of the Senator, after the Senator from Michigan conferred with us.

For the information of the Senator from Florida, I may say that the total savings thus made are \$14,762,838. Those are the savings made by all of the committee amendments, and the figures in connection with the various reductions have been printed in the Record.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, let me inquire if the committee amendment has been adopted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; it was adopted on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement, as proposed? The Chair hears no objection, and the agreement is entered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senators for permitting us to reach this agreement at this time.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of H. R. 3880, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1952, debate on any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be proposed shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such amendment or motion, and Mr. MAYBANK, respectively: *Provided*, That in the event Mr. MAYBANK is in favor of any such amendment or motion the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by Mr. WHERRY or some one designated by him.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the passage of the bill shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. WHERRY, respectively, or some one designated by the latter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that, under the unanimous-consent agreement which is in force, the Senator from Illinois has 15 more minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I like very briefly to explain the purport of the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator intend to ask for a vote on the amendment this afternoon?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to have a vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know the Senator will agree with me that the one great concern I have is, in connection with specifying the number of automobiles, that the Atomic Energy Commission I understand would lose 427 automobiles, and, since atomic energy projects have moved, not merely to rural sites, but into vast rural spaces, in far-off New Mexico and Idaho, as well as in the Savannah Valley, the situation is much more complex, and special consideration should be given to the number of automobiles for the Atomic Energy Commission, because of the distances to be traversed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say we have been much gentler with the Atomic Energy Commission than with the other agencies.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, I should like to call his attention to what his amendment would do to the Savannah River project and to the area represented by the Senators from Georgia. It would reduce by 279 the number of automobiles which otherwise would be available for 250,000 acres of land. I merely want to say that the Government chose those sites. No one requested it to August, Ga., or to Aiken, S. C., to appropriate the land there. I am sure the Senator from Georgia will agree with me that we do not have good railroad service in the swamps of the Savannah River and we do not have good bus service in the smaller towns, and, therefore, travel is none too easy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The principal point of this amendment is that, for all agencies other than the Atomic Energy Commission, their requests for additional automobiles are eliminated, and the number of replacements which they re-

quest is cut in half. In the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, the replacements are cut in half, but they are allowed one-half the new automobiles provided in the House bill; so they will have available about 149 new automobiles with which to cover the beautiful areas in Nevada and South Carolina, where the projects are to be located.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I am sure he appreciates the beauty of South Carolina, because he was trained there, not far from the atomic-energy project. But, in all seriousness, atomic energy is an expanding proposition, it is not one which is contracting, and we have called upon the Atomic Energy Commission to do twice the work this year that it did last year, so while some requests for additional automobiles might be reduced, I may say that a cut of 427 would be rather a severe cut in the good States of Nevada, New Mexico, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Georgia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This can be adjusted in conference, but I think it is very important to establish the principle that there are too many government automobiles, and that one way to reduce their number is to fail to replace some of them when they wear out and to stop the acquisition of additional automobiles.

This amendment would reduce the total number of automobiles by 825, and it would save approximately \$1,000,000.

It has the two safeguards which the Senator from Massachusetts called to our attention last week. There is a provision that the total number of automobiles must be reduced by the number of replacements not allowed. This is done by requiring the agency in question to turn in two automobiles for each replacement provided. There is a further safeguard, to which the Senator from Massachusetts referred last week, namely, the provision that the appropriations must be reduced by the amounts provided for the automobiles we are denying. Those two safeguards, to which the Senator from Massachusetts very properly called our attention, have been added to this amendment.

It would seem to me that, if we proceed on the theory that there should be a reduction in the total number of automobiles, we should carry it through for all agencies, and then the conference committee can make adjustments to provide particular agencies which may be affected by the amendment with an adequate number of automobiles.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is exactly what I wanted to call to the attention of my distinguished friend from Illinois, namely, that, on page 5, line 17, we could not make an adjustment in accordance with his amendment, insofar as the Atomic Energy Commission is concerned, because the House had cut the number to 300. We raised it to 576, as an adjustment; so we could not agree as to that commission only. The others could be adjusted, but I should like to have some adjustment, as the Senator himself suggested, in the conference, so far

as the number of automobiles to be provided for the Atomic Energy Commission is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the committee had been somewhat overgenerous to the Atomic Energy group regarding automobiles.

Mr. MAYBANK. Why does not the Senator propose to reduce the number in such a way that the conferees may be able to act regarding the 300 automobiles? The Senator now proposes to reduce it to a point where it would be impossible to consider the matter in conference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What does the Senator suggest?

Mr. MAYBANK. I would say 450. I merely want to be fair about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well; I accept that. I will accept the figure of 450.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the modification suggested?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is in the committee amendment, on page 5, lines 17 and 19, to strike "five hundred and seventy-six" and insert "four hundred fifty."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that that is accepted by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. So far as I am concerned, and speaking for the subcommittee, I may say it is acceptable. That will make possible a conference between the House figure of 300 automobiles and the Senator's figure of 450. The other amendment would cut it below the 300, and then there could have been no conference on it. I should like to inquire of the acting minority leader whether he is satisfied with it, since we have been working together on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand the time on the amendment is divided between the proponents and the opponents, if any.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has the floor for the purpose of speaking on his amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest that the time I have taken be deducted from the time of the opposition, or from my time, since I have not otherwise used any of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is he?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in opposition to the original amendment, yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from South Carolina. The Chair understands that the Senator from South Carolina is asking the Senator from Illinois to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct—in the time of the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the time of the Senator from South Carolina. Is that satisfactory to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to agree to that.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would say that the provision of 450 automobiles is all right. The provision of 149 automobiles would be all wrong, because there is a great deal of new business.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have accepted the amendment of 450 automobiles. Mr. President, that is about all I wanted to say. I think the Senate should accept the amendment and carry through with the reductions we provided in the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill. Even with the modification for the Atomic Energy Commission, which is a defense agency, my amendment would still cut out 525 automobiles and save about \$700,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, does his amendment now provide for 450 automobiles? If so, how many are for replacement only?

Mr. MAYBANK. Two hundred and twenty-nine, as in the bill, if I may say so; because I changed the figures.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator cut it to 114. Does the Senator from Illinois put it back to 200?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is all right; yes.

Mr. President, I think I have said about all I need to say. This is a chance to allow the population of Government automobiles to shrink by providing that the birth rate shall be kept below the death rate, so that there will be a net reduction.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator advise us what cut he has made in items for the replacement of automobiles, and what cut he proposes to make in the purchase of new automobiles?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The cut is about 200, in the case of replacements.

Mr. FERGUSON. Out of how many? Two hundred from what?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Out of approximately 568. We have eliminated new cars to the extent of approximately 327.

Mr. FERGUSON. From how many?

Mr. DOUGLAS. From a total of 841.

Mr. MAYBANK. They were replacements.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. The 327 reduction was from a total of 841 new cars. The total saving would amount to approximately 525 cars as a result of the modification for the Atomic Energy Commission instead of 825 cars as I had originally offered my amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Aside from the Atomic Energy Commission, the cut is just about the same as it was under the Labor-Federal Security bill, is it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator, and I hope that his amendment may be voted on and agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I see the accusing finger of the Senator from Nebraska across the way.

Mr. WHERRY. It is not always accusing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is admonitory.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Michigan covered the point, but I wish the Senator from Illinois would state for the RECORD percentage-wise what this cut will accomplish and how it relates to the other appropriation bill which was recently passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is precisely the same, with the exception of the Atomic Energy Commission. That is, it cuts in half the number of automobiles for replacement and cuts out additional automobiles completely.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The thought occurs to me that we cannot apply the cut to the Atomic Energy Commission in the same manner in which it could be applied to older and long-existing agencies, because atomic energy is a new field, which is expanding, and we have appropriated funds for new construction. For that reason we cannot compare it with any existing agency. We are only guessing at what we are doing with respect to the Atomic Energy Commission, because it is a new field in which scientists are opening up new jobs every month. We cannot apply to the Atomic Energy Commission the same scale or rule we would apply to old agencies which have existed for many years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was just such consideration as that which led the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to urge a more moderate policy with regard to the Atomic Energy Commission, and that led me to agree to the modification.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With reference to the Senator's amendment, there is a figure of 427 shown—

Mr. DOUGLAS. That figure should be changed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, we shall have to change the figures all through the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With reference to the Veterans' Administration item, the amendment strikes out the appropriation for the purchase of new automobiles for hospital facilities. I am wondering if that is not going too far. It eliminates new automobiles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is the same principle which we followed in connection with agencies under the Labor-Federal Security bill. I think we must ask the hospitals and the Veterans' Administration to observe the same principles of economy that apply to other agencies.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, we have allowed some replacements of old automobiles. It is not economy to operate old automobiles. But I had in mind veterans' automobiles, which are in a different category.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This matter will be in conference, and if the conferees think

it goes too far they can bring it up toward the House figure. I think it is a rule which can be modified in individual instances and we can bring about economy without too much hardship.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator understands, does he not, that if the conferees believe it to be proper, they may make a change in the figures?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. That is their privilege, although I hope the resulting figures will be kept low.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Hampshire, if I may have their attention for a moment, a question in connection with one of the largest sections of the bill. It has been feared that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan calling for a 10 percent reduction would affect contractors. The Atomic Energy Commission has been called upon to do 100 percent more work. It was my understanding that it was not the intention to affect the personnel of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The amount involved is about \$49,000,000, as I remember.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Commission has been fearful that the limiting language might adversely affect it. I told the Commission that it was not the intention of the Senator from Michigan, of the Senator from New Hampshire, or of the Senator from South Carolina, who worked and agreed on the amendment, together with the Senator from Tennessee, that it should affect them.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is that the understanding of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it also the understanding of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I just want the RECORD to show that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 64, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. . No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), and any funds appropriated in this act for any such purpose shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. This section shall not apply with respect to any person whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur for the President of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand, this amendment would not affect the Vice President or the Speaker of the House.

Mr. FERGUSON. It applies only to this particular bill. They are not mentioned in the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted to make certain of that, because I do not want to be legislating against our distinguished Vice President, the Speaker of the House, or the Chief Justice.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Chief Justice does not have a public chauffeur.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not want to take any chances.

Mr. FERGUSON. With respect to future bills, the Senator from Michigan proposes to follow the same course, with the exception of the officials who have been mentioned by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. This question may interest the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I hope to have his attention. His report showed that there were 4,755 part-time drivers in the field for the Atomic Energy Commission alone. My information is that with the exception of 7, these chauffeurs are the chauffeurs of contractors who are doing contracting work for the Federal Government. In other words, let us say a contractor has a contract in Idaho, or in Savannah, or in Paducah, and the automobiles are needed to get around to the jobs. The amendment would not apply to any contractor who has a contract with the Government, would it?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. MAYBANK. Those 4,755 part-time chauffeurs might do other work for the contractors; they might be bookkeepers or something else.

Mr. FERGUSON. They are not included, and they are also not using their automobiles for the carrying of passengers.

Mr. MAYBANK. I simply wanted the RECORD to be made clear on that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I send to the desk a list of those who would be affected, and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, would the Senator object to the list being read into the RECORD now?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to have it read. These are the chauffeurs who are employed, with the exception of those under the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Atomic Energy chauffeurs are not included?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, Mr. President, they are.

Mr. FERGUSON. When they are under contract.

Mr. MAYBANK. No. I may say that the Atomic Energy Commission has seven chauffeurs; three in New Mexico, one in Idaho, two in Schenectady, and one in Oak Ridge. Four are chauffeurs of contractors who have contracts in Idaho, New Mexico, Schenectady, or wherever they may be, in distant and rural areas of the States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; they are driving their cars, not for passengers, but to get to their work.

Mr. MAYBANK. To the backwoods, or wherever necessary. The Atomic Energy Commission itself has only seven chauffeurs.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from New York still want the list to be read?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, I should like to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the list.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Chauffeurs in the bill:

Bureau of the Budget, full time, District of Columbia, 3; field, none; total, 3. Part time, District of Columbia, 2; field, none; total, 2.

National Security Council, full time, District of Columbia, 1; field, none; total, 1. Part time, none.

National Security Resources Board, full time, District of Columbia, 6; field, none; total, 6. Part time, none.

Council of Economic Advisers, part time, 2; field, none; total, 2.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe the clerk is reading the names of some agencies that are not contained in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk is reading the matter which the Senator from Michigan asked to have placed in the RECORD.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand. I wish the clerk would read the list again slowly. I understand the clerk is reading from the paper presented by the Senator from Michigan for the RECORD, but I think some agencies have been included which are not in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan took these as extracts from the Byrd report. If they are not covered in the bill, naturally they would not be cut by the amendment, because the amendment applies only to agencies contained in the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that, but I want the record to be made straight. The National Security Council, for instance, was one of those read. Also the National Security Resources Board, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Those two are not covered by the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I simply wanted the record to be clear. I do not believe by this bill we can attempt to make cuts of agencies dealt with in other bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Michigan look over the list and see that it contains only agencies dealt with in the bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will check the list over with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am confused. I asked for a list of those who would be affected by the proposed amendment. We ought to have some accuracy in the statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. That is why we are now endeavoring to check up on this matter. There were two agencies, the second and the third on the list that are not included in the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator want the clerk to read the list now?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Chauffeurs in bill

	Full time			Part time		
	District of Columbia	Field	Total	District of Columbia	Field	Total
Bureau of the Budget	3	---	3	2	---	2
Council of Economic Advisers	---	---	---	2	---	2
Atomic Energy Commission	8	191	199	23	4,755	4,778
Civil Service Commission	3	---	3	1	---	1
Displaced Persons Commission	---	---	---	3	---	3
Federal Power Commission	1	---	1	---	---	---
Federal Trade Commission	1	---	1	1	---	1
General Accounting Office	2	---	2	1	---	1
General Services Administration	20	1	21	3	5	8
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13	---	13	4	---	4
NACA	1	---	1	2	5	7
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	---	---	---	1	---	1
National Gallery of Art	---	---	---	3	---	3
Office of Housing Expediter	3	---	3	3	---	3
Securities and Exchange Commission	1	---	1	2	---	2
Smithsonian Institution	1	---	1	---	---	---
Veterans' Administration	18	928	946	22	395	417

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not at all clear about the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. I do not think it has been printed yet. Has it?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was printed in connection with the original bill, the one we passed last week providing for the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. LEHMAN. But not for this bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator from Michigan explain briefly what classes of employees are cut from the bill by his proposed amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment covers only the chauffeurs whose duties consist of acting as chauffeurs or drivers of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle other than a bus or ambulance. In other words, it does not cover any bus transportation. It does not cover any ambulances.

Mr. LEHMAN. Would it include the automobiles and chauffeurs employed in field services as well as the District of Columbia service?

Mr. FERGUSON. It would cover it if the man was acting as a chauffeur of a passenger vehicle or the driver of a pas-

senger vehicle. In other words, the amendment does not cut out any automobiles. That was done by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in connection with a reduction in the number of cars. My proposal is to do away with chauffeurs or paid drivers, whether they be called chauffeurs or by any other name.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understood the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois it did not do away with all the automobiles.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. It simply limited the replacements and to some extent limited the purchase of new automobiles?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. So that there will be a great many automobiles in service?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Let us consider a hypothetical case.

Let us say that the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission now has a government-owned automobile. He has a government-paid chauffeur. He would not lose the automobile under this amendment; and unless it were taken away under the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, he would have the automobile, but he would not have a Government-paid chauffeur. He could hire his own chauffeur with his own funds to drive the car, or he could drive it himself. But the Government would not furnish a paid chauffeur for the Chairman of the Commission.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no idea whether there are enough such full-paid jobs in the District of Columbia, or too many, or too few. The number involved is very small. I am not going to argue that question. But when it comes to the field service, it seems to me that the situation is quite different. Take the Atomic Energy Commission. There are 191 in the field service. In the Veterans' Administration there are 928. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Michigan has had an opportunity really to survey the field and find out how many chauffeurs are now working in the field for the Atomic Energy Commission, or how many, if any, of the Veterans' Administration employees who serve as chauffeurs can be spared. It seems to me that it is not the proper procedure to make a general cut.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that if those in the field are not actually driving a bus or ambulance for the veterans, they can be spared. For example, the superintendent of a hospital may have a Government-owned car. He may have a publicly paid chauffeur serving full time in that position. He may do nothing but sit in the car, or keep it clean, and handle it in the way an ordinary chauffeur does. If he is not a full-time chauffeur, he may be an employee who is taken away from other work to act as a chauffeur.

The object is to try to eliminate those positions, whether they be in the field, in Detroit, or in Washington. The object is to eliminate unnecessary employees

during an emergency such as we have now. The Senator from Michigan is not trying merely to take jobs away from men. Many of these men would be hired by those for whom they now drive, and who would be entitled to a chauffeur if they wanted to pay for him with their own money. I believe that the fact that the Government spends money to furnish a Government official with a car is a great help to him. There has grown up, without any authorization from Congress, the practice of furnishing automobiles to thousands of Government employees. After they got the cars we went a step further and furnished them with chauffeurs. It is very difficult to identify who is a chauffeur and who is not.

The employees for whom cars and chauffeurs are furnished become a privileged class. They are not spending their own money for the privilege of having a chauffeur, but the taxpayers' dollars are being used to provide chauffeurs to drive public officials around.

I am sure that the Senator from New York, who has a car in Washington, has seen various Government cars being driven around by paid chauffeurs. Many of them are uniformed chauffeurs. All we want to do is to eliminate paid drivers for public officials. They can drive their own cars or hire their own chauffeurs.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I have pointed out, I am not particularly interested in chauffeurs or cars in the District of Columbia. However, I know that in the State of New York, when I was responsible for its administration, we could not have got along in our public health activities and our public works activities if we had not had a substantial number of cars on the job to do the work which was charged to the various departments to which they were attached.

I fear that what we are engaging in here is a hit-and-miss procedure. We say that we must cut out all the part-time chauffeurs in the field in every one of these agencies. I wonder what study or survey the distinguished Senator from Michigan and his associates, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and other Senators have made. I wonder what they have really done to ascertain whether there should be 900, 500, 100, or none. My objection goes to the hit-and-miss method which is being used in the consideration of this appropriation bill.

I wonder whether the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, in recommending these items, did not do, through his committee or otherwise, a considerable amount of surveying of the needs. Apparently the subcommittee came to the conclusion that these positions were needed. What are the sources of information of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. We have tried in committee—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not suggest anything. I asked Mr. Larson to furnish a list of all the automobiles and

chauffeurs. Mr. Larson has furnished such a list, which was printed in the RECORD, showing the thousands of automobiles owned by the Government, aside from military vehicles. I did not make any survey. I will say to the distinguished Senator from New York. I asked for certain information. We received it, and it is in the RECORD.

With respect to the cuts which are being made here, it is my attitude that if I accept any amendment it will be with the distinct understanding that it will have to be taken to conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I invite the attention of Senators to page 499 of the hearings, which shows that the General Services Administration and the State Department have pools of cars and are using a two-way radio system. As I understand, the Department of State has a number of cars which it is operating as a sort of transportation ferry. I believe that the General Services Administration operates in the same way. I would assume, from the conversation which I have just had with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, that if this amendment is accepted, it will be with the understanding that we will try to work it out in conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, that is all we can do. The Senator will be a member of the conference committee. There is a pool of automobiles in the General Services Administration as well as in the State Department. Calls are made from one building to another, and the cars are kept moving. That subject will have to be studied.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the time of the Senator from Michigan has expired, under the limitation.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has 15 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question with regard to his amendment. The last sentence in the amendment is as follows:

This section shall not apply with respect to any person whose duties consisted of acting as chauffeur for the President of the United States.

Would that include the Vice President?

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course he would be excluded. I suppose the Speaker of the House would also be excluded.

Mr. McFARLAND. What about the wife of the President?

Something should be done about Government cars. The number of them should be reduced. However, I am fearful that what is suggested may be false economy, because employees who ought to be at their jobs may be taken from their work to drive cars. When a car is used by various officials in a department, sometimes it is more economical to have a chauffeur than to have the car standing idle for a great part of the time.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator would have to address his question to the Senator from Michigan, who is the author of the amendment. However, I presume that under the terms of his amendment the President and the President's wife would both be excluded.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would exclude the President and his family.

Mr. McFARLAND. The amendment is not written that way.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not know the answer. The Senate instructed us to bring the bill back with a 10 percent reduction, and we did so. As these amendments have been brought up, all I have said is that we will take them to conference and try to work them out.

Mr. President, on page 498 there is a list showing passenger-carrying vehicles reported by executive agencies other than the Department of Defense, on hand as of March 1, 1951.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEHMAN. I will not take 3 minutes. I shall not labor the point. I know I shall be overborne by the sentiment expressed today and on other days. I wish, however, to enter a protest against the manner in which the pending appropriation bill and other appropriation bills, in certain particulars at least, are being approached. I hope I can be shown to be wrong, although I doubt it, but my judgment is that the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] made no survey of the needs which would justify a cutting out of all the field automobiles in the Atomic Energy Commission and in the Veterans' Administration. I do not believe they know whether the number should be a 1,000, 700, 400, or none. To make an arbitrary cut is not good legislation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not have the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to have it definitely understood that it is agreeable to me to have a yea-and-nay vote if Senators desire to have one. I now yield time to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. We are dealing with a problem which has had the attention of many Members of the Senate. It has had the attention of many Senators on the Appropriations Committee. No survey on this subject has ever been made by the legislative branch of the Government, so far as I know. The legislative branch, unfortunately, does not possess facilities for making such a survey.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say to the Senator that when the subject first came up before the subcommittee, I asked the General Services Administration to make a survey. On page 498 of the hearings reference is made to the survey made by the General Services Administration. The General Services Adminis-

tration found that there were 24,527 automobiles belonging to the Government, exclusive of any automobiles owned by the Military Establishment, the number of which I am told is greater than the 24,000 automobiles which the agencies own.

Mr. BRIDGES. The legislative branch of the Government not having facilities for investigating, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has indicated, the chairman asked a representative division of the Government to make such a survey. It was probably not a field survey. However, from time to time we have made spot checks in departments and divisions, and we have found a terrific abuse in the use of chauffeur-driven cars.

The Senator from New York has been around Washington long enough to know that he cannot go to a public or private function in Washington without being almost run over by the chauffeur-driven cars of persons who hold positions in the executive branch of the Government. To my mind it is certainly indicative of the abuse of the use of chauffeur-driven cars in Washington.

In the field the average person who is working as a field operative for the United States Government is competent to drive his own car. Unless he is a cripple or has suffered some misfortune which will not permit him to drive his own car, he is certainly able to do so. If he is not the victim of such a misfortune and cannot drive his own car he had better get out of the service of the United States Government, because if he is not competent to drive his own car he is not competent to be a field representative of the United States Government, unless he has suffered some peculiar disastrous illness or crippling injury, in which case certainly some consideration should be given.

The over-all studies, spot checks, and surveys which have been made resulted in the decision to offer the amendments. I do not think anyone would be hurt by the adoption of the amendment. I think it would be very helpful to eliminate some of the chauffeurs for some of the government bureaucrats, who ride around all over the country. It has got to the point where the abuse exists not only in the civilian agencies, but such abuses are becoming apparent also in the defense agencies. I do not believe a major, captain, or a colonel ever comes up to the Hill who is not being driven in a car with a private or a sergeant acting as chauffeur. It is a vicious circle. In some instances it may be wise to have the use of drivers. By and large the offering of the amendments is an effort to eliminate some of the abuses.

As the Senator from New York has pointed out, the amendment is not based upon an over-all individual survey. It is based upon sufficient facts, resulting from spot checks, information coming to us, and surveys such as the one ordered by the Senator from South Carolina, as chairman of the subcommittee, which would warrant support of the amendments. That is the general basis for the offering of the amendments.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield time to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not wish to take any more time if the Senator from South Carolina wishes to yield to another Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I did not mean it that way. I asked the question for my own information.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize that when one attends a diplomatic or other reception, he sees many cars which belong to officials. I believe I have the right to point out to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that the chauffeurs of many of the cars are paid by the owners of the cars. It is true in my case. I have no doubt it is also true in the case of many of the other Senators who attend dinners or receptions of an official character. I am not making any defense of the use of cars in Washington. I do not wish to give the impression that I do not realize that there may be an oversupply of cars in the Government service. What I do not like is what I would call a hit-and-miss way of approaching appropriations. I think it is bad.

I wish to repeat that the only factual information we have is that which has been collected by the subcommittee or the General Services Administration. I do not believe we have any information before us on which to base an arbitrary cut or eliminate the automobiles for all the field activities of the Veterans' Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York does not have the floor. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not correct to say that when requests are made for automobiles at first they are made only for the cars. The original request does not include chauffeurs or drivers. However, the driver of an automobile becomes a part of the personnel which is included in the estimate of the number of employees needed by a department.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Michigan understands the technique. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee for 15 years, and the technique is to ask first for an authorization. An authorization is made by a legislative committee. When the bill comes before the Senate it is said, "This is only an authorization. It does not carry any appropriation. The Senate is not obligated to make an appropriation." After the authorization becomes law, the representatives of the agencies come before the Appropriations Committee and say, "This is authorized by law. This is what you should do. You must appropriate. The Congress has spoken. The Congress has authorized it."

To some degree the same is also true about automobiles. First the department or agency says, "We have got to have automobiles." Incidentally, now they say, "We must have planes, too." It is not enough to have them ride; they must fly, too. We are going up, Mr. President. The next thing we know, not only are automobiles requested, but chauffeurs must be provided to drive the automobiles. It is the building up of a sort of vicious circle.

I admit to the Senator from New York that the amendment is not based on an over-all comprehensive survey made by the legislative branch itself, but we are warranted in taking the action proposed because of spot checks, personal observations, a careful survey made by the General Services Administration, and at least 15 years of observation, to my knowledge, of abuse in connection with this matter.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that this amendment is the culmination of a long effort in regard to this matter?

I see the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in the Chamber. I recall the fight in years gone by, when he and I, as Members of the House, struggled to require Government labels to be placed on all Government automobiles, so that it would be possible to know which automobiles were Government-owned.

So, I say this amendment is an effort to do something constructive in connection with that matter, and I certainly hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to read for the RECORD the figures in connection with this amendment, in case any Senator is not familiar with them. On July 1, 1950, there were on hand 19,888 automobiles in the various executive agencies other than the Department of Defense. At that time 3,968 automobiles were disposed of, and 4,073 automobiles were purchased, making a net increase of 105. There were 1,380 full-time chauffeurs and 5,672 part-time chauffeurs or drivers.

So by means of this amendment we are asking that the committee of conference determine how many of them can properly be eliminated without reducing efficiency.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. President, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has stated, several years ago the Senator from Illinois and others who at that time were House members of the committee of conference, fought very hard in favor of the bill requiring federally owned automobiles to be labeled as such. That was a step forward. I would almost go so far as to do all that I could to require that all Government-owned automobiles be painted yellow or some other peculiar hue or color, so that the public could immediately identify them. We would save many millions of dollars if we required that to be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that

if all Government-owned cars were required to be painted yellow, they would be found to be bunched together on the streets of Washington like bananas.

Mr. BRIDGES. That may be true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AFFIRMATION OF FRIENDSHIP OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FOR ALL THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) entitled "Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House and agree to the same.

TOM CONNALLY,
BRIEN McMAHON,
ALEXANDER WILEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

A. A. RUBINOFF,
BROOKS HAYS,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I assume that this report is on the concurrent resolution which was originally submitted by the Senator from Connecticut, and was adopted unanimously by the Senate, and that the Senate is now receding from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, 22 Senators sponsored the concurrent resolution and it was adopted by the Senate and was sent to the House of Representatives. The House has, I say very frankly, improved the concurrent resolution, and the Senate conferees are unanimous in agreeing to accept the changes which have been made by the House of Representatives.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, is the resolution in its final form long?

Mr. McMAHON. No. It is not very long.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how long would be required to read the concurrent resolution, as it would be modified in accordance with the conference report?

Mr. McMAHON. It would take about 5 minutes to read it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it should be read. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. McMAHON. Of course I would be happy to accede to the request. The Senator is interested in the changes which were made by the House of Representatives, I assume.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. If the concurrent resolution as thus amended is read now, we shall be able to see how it will stand after the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the minority leader in regard to the appropriation bill. However, he has been called from the Chamber temporarily. I understand that he will return before long. I suggest that following action on this conference report, we proceed until approximately 5 minutes after 6 with a few of the other amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have spoken with Senators on this side of the aisle, and I am sure they will be agreeable to having that course followed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I make that suggestion because in that way we shall be able to clean up several of the amendments after the conference report is acted on.

Mr. McMAHON. Then, Mr. President, I suggest that in accordance with the request of the Senator from Michigan, the concurrent resolution as reported by the committee of conference, which is the version adopted by the House of Representatives, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States reaffirms the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, and declares—

That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of the desires of the American people to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people believe the Soviet Government could advance the cause of peace immeasurably by removing those artificial barriers, thus permitting the free exchange of information between our peoples; and

That the American people and their Government desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That, although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to resolve the differences standing between the United States Government and

the Soviet Government and invite the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship in this endeavor; and

That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in permitting the concurrent resolution as proposed to be amended in accordance with the conference report to be read, and I think all Members of the Senate approve of the concurrent resolution and hope that the leaders of the Soviet Union will actually call it to the attention of the people of Russia. If we find that it is not called to the attention of the Russian people, I suggest that all means possible should be used by our own Government to see that the people of the Soviet Union and the people of the satellite countries learn of our friendship for them.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I hope and trust that the President of the United States, when this message is sent by him to the head of the Soviet Government, for dissemination to its people, will reiterate and make very clear his own desire that this message be promulgated to the people of the Soviet Union, because it is my belief and the belief of all other Members of this body that if the peoples of the Soviet Union really knew what was in our hearts and minds, it would indeed be impossible to continue to make them believe that what we wanted was to enslave the world, and they would understand that what we really want, above all else, is peace in the world, because on a very practical basis I do not know of any people in the world who have more to lose from a third world war than the American people themselves.

So I am delighted with the action which I am sure the Senate is about to take, and I wish to thank the Senator from Michigan for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I call up the amendment previously submitted by me, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], on page 22, in line 18, relative to the Chicago post office, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, line 18, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the period on line 25.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the case of this particular amendment, let me say—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator does not expect to have the Senate vote on the amendment tonight, does he?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] told the sponsors of the amendment that we had proceeded on the wrong assumption in regard to the amendment, and he wished to explain it. If I correctly understand his explanation, I propose to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was going to say that, as the Senator from New Hampshire knows, there has been a report made on this proposal by the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECKHART]. My information is that it would ultimately cost \$60,000,000 if the Government should rent this property.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to have an explanation from the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MAYBANK. My information is that greater expense would be involved if this provision were not adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire will yield, I may say that when the Government erected the new Federal building in Chicago, it was built so as to straddle a street which is now in process of widening, and which is one of the principal arteries used in getting from the Loop. That matter was reasonably understood at the time the Federal building was constructed, and so a high archway was left in the middle of the building, up to about what would be called the second floor, with the understanding that if Congress Street were ever widened, it would be possible to put that street through the middle of the new post office building in Chicago. The widening process is now under way, and when the street finally goes through the middle of the Federal building, it will mean that that section of the building which is devoted to deliveries of parcel post, to motor vehicles, and to many other things, will be completely separate from the other portion of the building.

It now becomes necessary in order to meet that problem; and, in order to have necessary facilities with which to work at the present time, as well as in the future, taking into account that there will be a tremendous increase in the postal load, to acquire the land across the street, and the money which is involved in this item is for that purpose. Without it, simply nothing can be done and if there is much delay the cost will be infinitely more than the price for which the land can be purchased at the present time. It is entirely possible that it would cost 3 or 4 times as much, before we get through. So this is in the interest of economy.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I should like to say to the very able and distinguished Senator from Illinois that, as members of the Committee on Appropriations, we sat through the hearing, and the information we got from the testimony was in accord with his statement. That was one reason why we arrived at the conclusion that it would be a very sound appropriation of money, because, as the Senator says, without an appropriation, the rent would amount to a great deal more in course of time, and if we failed to make the purchase soon, the cost of the property would increase and we would have a great many additional dollars to appropriate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may add one or two other observations. There is another property which can be acquired at the present time.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Consequently, if we had to move that Federal building to some other site, the cost would be enormous. The second observation is that I fully verified the facts of the situation with the Postmaster General, and he completely concurred in the observations I make on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the building was erected was it constructed in anticipation of this widening?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was. The building has been so constructed that it is highly arched in the middle, and the street can go right through the middle of the building. But by virtue of putting that thoroughfare through the building linkage from one side of the building to the other would be almost completely cut off. So the property across the street is absolutely necessary in order to carry on and to expedite the business of the Post Office Department. This item is not for the construction of a building. This is for acquiring the land at a time when the land can be bought, not necessarily at a bargain price, but at a very decent price.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The testimony of Mr. Reynolds, found at page 502 of the hearings, showed that the present owners came down \$600,000, and accepted the appraisal of the Government of \$3,200,000 for the land. The total purchase price for the land and for the buildings was \$6,552,531.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was a very reasonable price, by the way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That, at least, represents my opinion of the matter.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in view of the explanation given, it is not the intention of the Senator from New Hampshire and his colleagues to urge the amendment. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire withdraws his amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from South Carolina would care to have presented any further amendments. It is 15 minutes of 6 o'clock. We really ought to have a better attendance on the floor if further amendments are to be considered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment. I ask that it may lie on the table and be printed. I propose to call up the amendment tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. FERGUSON. May we make the amendment "6-15-51-B" the pending question for tomorrow morning, so there will be something before the Senate when it reconvenes?

Mr. McFARLAND. That would be perfectly all right with me, except that—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor, and he yielded to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was going to make a suggestion with respect to the battle

monuments amendment. I went to Europe last summer, and I tried to bring about the application of counterpart funds to the work of the Battle Monuments Commission while I was there; and the Commission, under General North, also tried to have that done, but there was no counterpart money available for that purpose. So I am only saying that I should be glad to carry the amendment to conference, but I want to assure the Senator from Michigan that last summer there was none of that money available. I will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, for the benefit of the Senate and for the benefit of the conference, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD an explanatory statement and also a table prepared by the Department of State entitled "Outstanding Foreign Credits Payable in Local Currencies as of December 31, 1950." It is the latest report I could get.

There being no objection, the statement and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

This amendment is a simple proviso, requiring that wherever practicable expenditures for the operations of the American Battle Monuments Commission in foreign countries shall be from local currencies which are held to the credit of the Treasury.

I think it is a fair statement that no one anywhere knows just how much credit the United States Government has with other nations. The Secretary of the Treasury's annual report shows something like \$1,750,000,000 in accounts receivable under active agreements with foreign governments involving lend-lease articles or services and surplus property. In addition there are the counterpart funds which are to our credit under ECA, which provided that 5 percent of the counterparts should be available to us for administrative expenses. I understand that an interdepartmental committee is at work on planning to reconcile all the various credits outstanding so that we may get some idea of their possible utilization.

I have here a table furnished me by the State Department of "Outstanding Foreign Credits Payable in Local Currencies as of December 31, 1950." The total is more than \$750,000,000.

It seems to me that we should make every effort to utilize such credits, and this proviso is a step in that direction.

EXHIBIT C.—Department of State—Outstanding foreign credits payable in local currencies as of Dec. 31, 1950

Countries	Surplus property agreements		Lend-Lease agreements	War Assets agreements	Reparations allocations	On deposit U. S. Treasury, Dec. 31, 1950	Held by United States DO in trust for Treasury	Total amount payable in local currencies
	Principal	Interest						
American Republics:								
Argentina								
Bolivia			\$15,644			\$221,600		\$227,244
Brazil	\$84,027						\$2,024,218	2,108,245
Chile						209,241		209,241
Colombia	105,059					22,650		127,709
Costa Rica							12,000	12,000
Cuba	260,350							260,350
Ecuador	351,381	\$9,083				2,993		363,457
Honduras							28,500	28,500
Mexico			5,250,000					5,250,000
Nicaragua								
Panama								
Peru	328,531	3,359						331,890
Venezuela	6,372							6,372
Europe:								
Austria	8,455,114	192,172		\$2,732,600		1,015,689		12,396,575
Belgium-Luxemburg	17,990,738					72,059		18,062,797
Bulgaria								
Czechoslovakia	5,223,855						80,000	5,303,855
Denmark	904,637					894,337		1,798,974
Finland	17,995,831			4,930,873				22,926,704
France	67,438,857			5,338,302		5,621,100		68,398,319

EXHIBIT C.—Department of State—Outstanding foreign credits payable in local currencies as of Dec. 31, 1950—Continued

Countries	Surplus property agreements		Lend-Lease agreements	War Assets agreements	Reparations allocations	On deposit U. S. Treasury, Dec. 31, 1950	Held by United States DO in trust for Treasury	Total amount payable in local currencies
	Principal	Interest						
Europe—Continued								
Germany.....	\$96,357,217					\$183,902		\$96,541,119
Hungary.....	14,061,808						\$24,925	14,086,733
Iceland.....	359,428					39,628		399,056
Italy.....	141,885,856				\$184,000			142,069,856
Netherlands.....	16,957,791			\$615,620		89,167		17,662,578
Norway.....	4,183,800	\$13,316	\$5,900,000	455,000		56,608		10,608,724
Poland.....	36,320,221							36,320,221
Portugal.....	14,400							14,400
Spain.....					500,000		809,389	1,309,389
Sweden.....	1,659,443							1,659,443
Switzerland.....	12,670							12,670
Trieste.....								
Yugoslavia.....			500,000					500,000
British Commonwealth and Empire:								
Australia.....	6,227,831		62,093			538,844		6,828,768
Canada.....	3,969,389					3	75,002	4,044,391
New Zealand.....	1,232,948							1,232,948
South Africa.....	32,800,000					250,000		33,050,000
United Kingdom.....								
Africa—Near and Middle East:								
Burma.....	4,240,140					313,604		4,553,744
Egypt.....						5,901,218		5,901,218
Ethiopia.....	39,861		200,000					239,861
Greece.....	53,319,760					2,243,433		55,563,193
India-Pakistan.....	10,792,424					10,340,775		21,133,199
Iran.....	23,362,692					2,115,308		25,478,000
Iraq.....						1,913,783		1,913,783
Israel-Palestine-Jordan.....						568,409		568,409
Lebanon-Syria.....	560,345	7,046						567,391
Liberia.....	332,672							332,672
Saudi Arabia.....	52,416							52,416
Turkey.....	3,306,849					71,429		3,378,278
Eritrea.....	34,000							34,000
Far East:								
China.....	50,161,019							50,161,019
Indonesia.....	62,296,507					101,316		62,397,823
Japan.....	13,837,735							13,837,735
Korea.....	20,950,019					294,056		21,244,075
Philippines.....	2,333,169			1,016,485				3,349,654
Thailand.....	5,431,516							5,431,516
Total.....	686,238,678	224,976	12,327,737	15,088,880	684,000	33,146,660	3,054,034	750,754,965

Mr. MAYBANK. I may add, in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Michigan, that General North advised me in writing—and I shall be glad to confine my remarks to that—to the effect that a great deal of the counterpart money had already been committed, and therefore there was none which could be committed to the Battle Monuments Commission. I know the Senator from Michigan does not desire to cripple the Battle Monuments Commission.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at all.

Mr. MAYBANK. The sole duty of the Battle Monuments Commission is to look after the graves of American servicemen who are buried in foreign soil. I will take the amendment to conference, and if the State Department has any funds which are still available, I shall insist upon it; but I was told, and General North was told, that it does not have money available for the purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, the Senator from South Carolina is willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. It was my hope that some of these expenses could be paid by the Battle Monuments Commission, through the use of counterpart money. General North and I worked hard and long on it. We could obtain none of those funds. I know the Senator would not expect me to take the amendment to conference unless the funds could be obtained from the State Department.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. If we can get the funds from the State Department, I think we should then increase the funds

for the monuments as may be found necessary.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think that is far more important, and that the program of the Battle Monuments Commission is far more important than certain of the things for which the State Department is now spending money. Nevertheless, it will depend upon what we can get from the State Department. I shall use my every effort to get the funds, and I shall immediately communicate with General North what the Senator from Michigan has suggested. General North feels the same way about it as I do. He and I tried to work the matter out last October, as I recall the time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is to be carried to conference. If we can get the funds from the State Department, by way of money for foreign aid, well and good. If we cannot, the Senator from Michigan agrees that the money will not be appropriated.

The amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON, for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHERRY, and agreed to, is as follows:

On page 5, line 10, change the period to a colon and insert "Provided, That foreign currencies available to the credit of the Treasury shall be used to defray expenses incurred for this purpose wherever practicable."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which I

offer at this time and ask that it be stated by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the figures "\$1,883,615" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,585,553."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask that certain amendments which I have prepared be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DECLARATION OF CONSCIENCE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me before he renews his motion?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, a year ago I made a speech in this chamber which has been called the Declaration of Conscience. What I said then is even more applicable today particularly in view of statements made in the past few days.

I ask unanimous consent that the so-called "Declaration of Conscience" be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GROWING CONFUSION—NEED FOR PATRIOTIC THINKING

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly and simply about a serious national condition. It is a national

feeling of fear and frustration that could result in national suicide and the end of everything that we Americans hold dear. It is a condition that comes from the lack of effective leadership either in the legislative branch or the executive branch of our Government. That leadership is so lacking that serious and responsible proposals are being made that national advisory commissions be appointed to provide such critically needed leadership.

I speak as briefly as possible because too much harm has already been done with irresponsible words of bitterness and selfish political opportunism. I speak as simply as possible because the issue is too great to be obscured by eloquence. I speak simply and briefly in the hope that my words will be taken to heart.

Mr. President, I speak as a Republican. I speak as a woman. I speak as a United States Senator. I speak as an American.

The United States Senate has long enjoyed world-wide respect as the greatest deliberative body in the world. But recently that deliberative character has too often been debased to the level of a forum of hate and character assassination sheltered by the shield of congressional immunity.

It is ironic that we Senators can in debate in the Senate, directly or indirectly, by any form of words, impute to any American who is not a Senator any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming an American—and without that non-Senator American having any legal redress against us—yet if we say the same thing in the Senate about our colleagues we can be stopped on the grounds of being out of order.

It is strange that we can verbally attack anyone else without restraint and with full protection, and yet we hold ourselves above the same type of criticism here on the Senate floor. Surely the United States Senate is big enough to take self-criticism and self-appraisal. Surely we should be able to take the same kind of character attacks that we "dish out" to outsiders.

I think that it is high time for the United States Senate and its Members to do some real soul searching and to weigh our consciences as to the manner in which we are performing our duty to the people of America and the manner in which we are using or abusing our individual powers and privileges.

I think it is high time that we remembered that we have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution. I think it is high time that we remembered that the Constitution, as amended, speaks not only of the freedom of speech but also of trial by jury instead of trial by accusation.

Whether it be a criminal prosecution in court or a character prosecution in the Senate, there is little practical distinction when the life of a person has been ruined.

Those of us who shout the loudest about Americanism in making character assassinations are all too frequently those who, by our own words and acts, ignore some of the basic principles of Americanism—

The right to criticize.

The right to hold unpopular beliefs.

The right to protest.

The right of independent thought.

The exercise of these rights should not cost one single American citizen his reputation or his right to a livelihood nor should he be in danger of losing his reputation or livelihood merely because he happens to know some one who holds unpopular beliefs. Who of us does not? Otherwise none of us could call our souls our own. Otherwise thought control would have set in.

The American people are sick and tired of being afraid to speak their minds lest they be politically smeared as Communists or Fascists by their opponents. Freedom of speech is not what it used to be in America.

It has been so abused by some that it is not exercised by others.

The American people are sick and tired of seeing innocent people smeared and guilty people whitewashed. But there have been enough proved cases, such as the Amerasia case, the Hiss case, the Coplon case, the Gold case, to cause Nation-wide distrust and strong suspicion that there may be something to the unproved, sensational accusations.

As a Republican, I say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that the Republican Party faces a challenge today that is not unlike the challenge which it faced back in Lincoln's day. The Republican Party so successfully met that challenge that it emerged from the Civil War as the champion of a united Nation—in addition to being a party which unrelentingly fought loose spending and loose programs.

Today our country is being psychologically divided by the confusion and the suspicions that are bred in the United States Senate to spread like cancerous tentacles of "know nothing, suspect everything" attitudes. Today we have a Democratic administration which has developed a mania for loose spending and loose programs. History is repeating itself—and the Republican Party again has the opportunity to emerge as the champion of unity and prudence.

The record of the present Democratic administration has provided us with sufficient campaign issues without the necessity of resorting to political smears. America is rapidly losing its position as leader of the world simply because the Democratic administration has pitifully failed to provide effective leadership.

The Democratic administration has completely confused the American people by its daily contradictory grave warnings and optimistic assurances, which show the people that our Democratic administration has no idea of where it is going.

The Democratic administration has greatly lost the confidence of the American people by its complacency to the threat of communism here at home and the leak of vital secrets to Russia through key officials of the Democratic administration. There are enough proved cases to make this point without diluting our criticism with unproved charges.

Surely these are sufficient reasons to make it clear to the American people that it is time for a change and that a Republican victory is necessary to the security of the country. Surely it is clear that this Nation will continue to suffer so long as it is governed by the present ineffective Democratic administration.

Yet to displace it with a Republican regime embracing a philosophy that lacks political integrity or intellectual honesty would prove equally disastrous to the Nation. The Nation sorely needs a Republican victory. But I do not want to see the Republican Party ride to political victory on the four horsemen of calumny—fear, ignorance, bigotry, and smear.

I doubt if the Republican Party could do so simply because I do not believe the American people will uphold any political party that puts political exploitation above national interest. Surely we Republicans are not so desperate for victory.

I do not want to see the Republican Party win that way. While it might be a fleeting victory for the Republican Party, it would be a more lasting defeat for the American people. Surely it would ultimately be suicide for the Republican Party and the two-party system that has protected our American liberties from the dictatorship of a one-party system.

As members of the minority party, we do not have the primary authority to formulate the policy of our Government. But we do have the responsibility of rendering con-

structive criticism, of clarifying issues, of allaying fears by acting as responsible citizens.

As a woman, I wonder how the mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters feel about the way in which members of their families have been politically mangled in Senate debate—and I use the word debate advisedly.

As a United States Senator, I am not proud of the way in which the Senate has been made a publicity platform for irresponsible sensationalism. I am not proud of the reckless abandon in which unproved charges have been hurled from this side of the aisle. I am not proud of the obviously staged, undignified countercharges which have been attempted in retaliation from the other side of the aisle.

I do not like the way the Senate has been made a rendezvous for vilification, for selfish political gain at the sacrifice of individual reputations and national unity. I am not proud of the way we smear outsiders from the floor of the Senate and hide behind the cloak of congressional immunity and still place ourselves beyond criticism on the floor of the Senate.

As an American, I am shocked at the way Republicans and Democrats alike are playing directly into the Communist design of "confuse, divide, and conquer." As an American, I do not want a Democratic administration whitewash or cover-up any more than I want a Republican smear or witch hunt.

As an American, I condemn a Republican Fascist just as much as I condemn a Democrat Communist. I condemn a Democrat Fascist just as much as I condemn a Republican Communist. They are equally dangerous to you and me and to our country. As an American, I want to see our Nation recapture the strength and unity it once had when we fought the enemy instead of ourselves.

RECESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. I now renew my motion that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 18 (legislative day, May 17), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. William Edward Bergin, O7127, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as The Adjutant General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Burman Bush, O6650, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 18 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America

to the sixth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization:

Howland H. Sargeant, of Rhode Island.
George D. Stoddard, of Illinois.
Mrs. Helen C. Russell, of California.
Elvin C. Stakman, of Minnesota.
George F. Zook, of Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may we enter upon the duties of this week confidently and courageously, assured that Thy divine presence is ever round about us.

Grant that when we are confronted with difficult decisions we may not yield to those pressures which would make us subservient to our lesser and baser selves.

May all the resources of power and wisdom, which have been revealed and placed at the disposal of humanity, be sanctified and dedicated to the loftiest and noblest purposes.

We penitently confess that we are sometimes greatly bewildered and confused and frightened when we think of the vast and marvelous amount of physical power which now belongs to our modern world.

May the mind and heart of man be endowed with those moral and spiritual controls which will be adequate to direct and channel all these powers and energies to safe and beneficent ends and for the welfare of mankind and Thy glory.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 15, 1951, was read and approved.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952 (Rept. No. 582), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HORAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 20 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

EFFECTING COOPERATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation designed to achieve more effective and efficient cooperation between government and industry in the defense program by spelling out provisions under which industry advisory committees to defense agencies shall be organized and shall function.

During World War II, industry advisory committees contributed substantially to the most outstanding production job in the world's history. Since the collapse of the Axis Powers, both Japanese and Nazi military leaders have stated repeatedly that it was America's capacity for production, achieved on an all-out basis, which provided the Allies with the margin for victory.

The present Defense Production Act, passed last year, contemplates that advisory committees to the defense agencies operate under a system similar to that which was so successful during the war against the Axis.

It seems, however, that the Justice Department has discovered the World War II system of advisory committees was somehow illegal—that such committees, in recommending prices and allocations of materials and supplies, might often find themselves in conflict with the antitrust laws. This discovery has come at a very late hour.

To prevent these committees from violating the antitrust laws, the Justice Department has directed that they shall have full-time Federal bureaucrats as chairmen, with the agenda for each meeting prepared by such chairmen. This means, of course, that industry members would have a hard time getting before the Government proposals which their respective chairmen might not favor.

If fear that the system of advisory committees in effect during the last war might place similar committees in the current defense program in danger of violating the antitrust laws is the motivating influence behind the Justice Department's contention, I feel sure that our distinguished Attorney General, the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, will welcome the legislation I am proposing.

My objective is to remove the legal barriers to full cooperation between government and industry in the defense program—to break through the bureaucratic red tape which frequently hampers efficiency in essential all-out production.

I am seeking to achieve this objective by providing for exemption of these advisory committees from provisions of the antitrust laws, only in their relationship to the defense program.

Controls for controls' sake is not the way to promote more effective and efficient cooperation between government and industry. My amendment would permit more freedom to industry in defense production without granting any immunity to participants in their normal nondefense operations.

THE LATE T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to report to the House the sudden and untimely death of a great and beloved citizen of my district who served that district for a period of 18 years in this House. He was intimately known to and beloved by many of the Members still here. As many of you have seen in the papers, Hon. T. Alan Goldsborough died suddenly Saturday night.

He was an outstanding Marylander, descended from a famous family. He fully lived up to its great tradition. He served with distinction in this body for nine terms before going on the Federal bench, where he continued his career with equal distinction during the past 12 years.

Perhaps the most significant thing to his neighbors, friends, and former constituents was the deep human understanding and the kindly heart of this great American, who devoted so much of his life to public service, both big and little. Hundreds of the members of his own community have in their hearts deep gratitude to Judge Goldsborough for some generous act or service rendered. It is with profound sorrow that I report the loss of this fine patriot and personal friend.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As a Member who served with Judge Alan Goldsborough during all the time he was in Congress, I want to join the gentleman from Maryland in expressing my profound sorrow at the passing of one of the finest Americans I have ever known.

He was honest, courageous, and conscientiously devoted to the welfare of his country. All the time he served in this body he put the welfare of his country first.

His passing is a great loss to the American people.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for so well expressing what so many of us think.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, other Members may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the life and services of Judge Goldsborough.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Judge T. Alan Goldsborough the bench and the country have lost an outstanding citizen and servant. He served well his day and generation. I have lost a real friend. Judge Goldsborough was a good man. I shall miss him very much along with his other admirers and friends.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 15

minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SCHOOL LOCKERS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the other day I spoke about the National Production Administration having refused to allow 5,000 tons of steel to be used for 750,000 school lockers. Today I have a telegram from my State that the Precision Equipment Co., 3712 North Milwaukee, Chicago, Ill., is advertising all sizes of lockers for shipment in 20 to 30 days with D097 priority, prices about 50 percent over market.

It would appear from this that there is considerable steel in the black market or available from imports of steel for school-locker purposes, but new schools are unable to obtain steel for locker purposes. Unless the NPA changes its present attitude, school districts will be forced to suffer great inconvenience and additional costs.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MIGRATORY FARM LABOR

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the calendar for this week carries, along with the revenue bill for 1951, the bill H. R. 3283, the so-called migratory farm labor bill.

This particular piece of legislation is one which deserves much more publicity than it has received. It affects directly some one million migratory farm laborers in the United States. It involves also approximately 500,000 illegal Mexican entrants who come into this country every year to work in the cotton fields of the South and in the sugarbeet fields and vegetable farms and gardens of the far West.

Congressman POLK, of Ohio, and I have filed a minority report on this legislation, and we intend to have copies in the hands of every Member. We ask you to study this minority report and to be present here in the House when this bill comes up for debate.

SAYING WHAT OTHER PEOPLE SAY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], who just left the well of the House, if memory serves me correctly, last week cautioned the Republican Members that when they used someone else's speech to give credit to the author. I do not know of any Republican who was ever forced to use anyone else's ideas or words in order to express his opinion of the administration or its works. Perhaps he should have. I know I have had some letters referring to Secretary Acheson with words which the rules of the House prohibit me from using on the floor. But I say to the gentleman, if he wants to get examples where Members of the administration have used someone else's talk or speech, all he has to do is go back over the record a few years, and find where in one week two Cabinet members used the same speech.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday this week be dispensed with.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I expect to object—

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday until veterans' legislation now on the calendar is considered by the House.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi has made a charge that is absolutely unfounded. On two occasions the gentleman has made an oblique reference to me. I hope someday he will make a direct reference, because I have a speech to make.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first business on the Consent Calendar.

SUSPENDING APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 240) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with re-

spect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigation ordered by House Resolution 78, Eighty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. FORD objected.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT NEW CASTLE, DEL., ON JUNE 16

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3573) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of the settling of New Castle, Del., to be held in New Castle, Del., on June 16, 1951.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be stricken from the calendar, due to the fact that the President authorized the attendance of the Marine Band to this function and there is no need for the legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SUSPENDING APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYMENT OF ATTORNEY BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the resolution (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to state that I have consulted with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and I believe an agreement has been worked out whereby section 2 of the resolution will be deleted. If this is done I have no objection to the resolution's being considered at this time. I have not had an opportunity to present an amendment to the Clerk, but if I could offer it—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may offer any germane amendment after the bill is considered.

The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of Robert T. Murphy as an attorney on a temporary basis to assist the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284, of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to exempt an attorney employed by

the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and members and certain employees of the President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights from the operation of certain conflict-of-interest statutes."

With the following committee amendment:

Add a new section 2 to the bill to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That service of an individual as a member of the President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights, established by Executive Order Numbered 10207 of January 23, 1951, or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman's amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. FORD. It would be; yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be placed at the foot of the calendar to be brought up last so that I may have an opportunity to present an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REVISION OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4200) to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, is further amended by—

(a) Deleting in sections 116 and 214 the last sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following sentence: "Except when suspended under the provisions of section 426 (c), the remaining provisions of this title shall be effective during any period in which title III of this act is not in effect."

(b) Amending section 301 to read as follows:

"Sec. 301. The authority granted by this title and all provisions thereof shall be effective during any period when the total number of line officers serving on active duty exceeds the number of line officers holding permanent appointments in the grade of ensign and above on the active list of the Regular Navy: *Provided*, That with respect to provisions relating to officers serving in grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and lieutenant, the President during any period that he determines the needs of the service so require may suspend the operation of any or all such provisions of this title."

(c) Deleting in the last sentence of subsection (g) of section 303 the word "annual" and changing the period at the end of the said sentence to a colon and adding the

following new proviso: "*Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection relating to the authorized number of officers in grade, in order to make adjustments for the number of officers in the Naval Reserve who may be ordered to active duty in any grade pursuant to this act or to other provisions of law, the authorized number of officers in each grade concerned may be temporarily exceeded by such number of officers ordered to active duty in such grade until the next succeeding computation authorized by this subsection shall be made."

(d) Amending subsections (g) and (h) of section 303 by deleting where appearing the words "as of January 1 of each year" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "at such times that the needs of the service require but not less than once annually."

(e) Changing the period at the end of subsection (n) of section 304 to a colon and adding the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the President, during any period that he determines the needs of the service so require, may suspend the operation of this subsection."

(f) Inserting in the first sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 305 after the word "senior" the words "in permanent rank."

(g) Inserting in the first sentence of subsection (f) of section 314, between the words "active" and "list," the words "or retired" and deleting in the third proviso of that subsection the words "major general on the active list" and substituting therefor the words "major general or above on the active or retired list."

(h) Amending section 426 by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(c) The President may, at such time or times as he may deem advisable during any war or national emergency declared after the effective date of this act, suspend the operation of any or all of the provisions of this act which relate to the distribution in grades, promotion by selection, involuntary retirement and discharge of officers of the naval service, and such suspension shall not continue beyond June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which such war or national emergency shall end."

Sec. 2. (a) The act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, is further amended by changing the period at the end of section 5 to a colon and adding the following proviso: "*Provided*, That officers shall be temporarily appointed pursuant to this act to grades above lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy and first lieutenant in the Marine Corps only upon the recommendation of a board of officers convened for that purpose."

(b) Section 5 of such act is further amended by—

(1) Inserting, immediately after "Sec. 5" the subsection designation "(a)"; and

(2) Inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In addition to recommending those officers whom it considers fully qualified for temporary appointment to higher grades, such a board shall also report, from among the officers whose names are presented to it for consideration, the names of any officers of the active list of less than 20 years' service whose records in its opinion indicate their unsatisfactory performance of duty in their present grades and in its opinion indicate that they would not satisfactorily perform the duties of a higher grade. Officers holding permanent appointments on the active list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps in the grades of warrant officer and above whose names are so reported shall, except as hereinafter provided, be honorably discharged from the naval service on the first day of the fourth month following that in which their names are thus reported with a lump-sum payment computed on the basis of 2 months' active-duty pay at time of discharge for each year of commissioned service com-

puted in accordance with subsection 102 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, for line officers and subsection 202 (d) of that act for staff officers, but not to exceed a total of 1 year's active-duty pay. No such officer who is under consideration for or undergoing disciplinary action of any kind shall be separated from the naval service prior to the final disposition of his case and he shall thereafter without delay be separated from the naval service pursuant to this subsection or other provisions of law, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy. An officer holding permanent appointment as a commissioned warrant or warrant officer and serving temporarily in a higher grade, or an officer designated for limited duty who when appointed for the performance of limited duty only held a permanent appointment as a commissioned warrant or warrant officer, whose name is so reported shall, in lieu of such honorable discharge from the naval service, have the option of reverting to the grade and status he would have held had he not been so appointed. An officer designated for limited duty who when appointed for the performance of limited duty only held a permanent rating below warrant officer, whose name is so reported shall, in lieu of such honorable discharge from the naval service, have the option of reverting to the grade and status he would have held had he not been so appointed and instead had been appointed a warrant officer. In any computation to determine the grade and status to which such officers may revert, all of their active service as an officer designated for limited duty or as a temporary or reserve officer shall be included."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUR LABELING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2321) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a rule has been granted on this bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

OFFICIAL REGISTERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1183) to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretaries of the military departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, are authorized to have published, annually or at such times as they may designate, official registers containing the names of and pertinent data relating to such officers of the Regular and Reserve components of their respective services and such other lists as they may deem appropriate.

Sec. 2. All laws or parts of laws requiring the periodic publication of an official register of the Army, of the Navy and Marine Corps, and of the Air Force, and prescribing the contents thereof, including, but not restricted to, provisions relating to lists of names, grades, pay and emoluments, and personal data inconsistent with the provisions of this section are repealed and such

repeal shall include but shall not be limited to the following acts or parts of acts:

(a) Section 2 of the act of June 18, 1878 (20 Stat. 149).

(b) So much of section 1226, Revised Statutes (18 Stat. 215), as reads: "The highest volunteer rank which has been held by officers of the Regular Army shall be entered, with their names respectively, upon the Army Register."

(c) So much of section 1256, Revised Statutes, 18 Stat. 218), as reads "continue to be borne upon the Army Register, or Navy Register, as the case may be, and shall."

(d) The ultimate proviso of section 1 of the act of May 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 735).

(e) The words "and directed" in the seventh line of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1409).

(f) So much of the first sentence of section 201 of the act of June 29, 1948 (Public Law 810, 80th Cong.), as reads "to be published annually in the official Register of the service concerned."

(g) So much of subsection 301 (a) of the act of June 29, 1948 (Public Law 810, 80th Cong.), as reads "to be published annually in the official Register of the service concerned."

(h) So much of section 1457, Revised Statutes (18 Stat. 253), as reads "and continue to be borne on the Navy Register."

(i) So much of section 1406, Revised Statutes (18 Stat. 248), as reads "and shall be entered upon the naval register."

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN EASEMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4024) to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to grant and convey without reimbursement and on such terms and conditions as he determines to be in the public interest, to the following grantees the following easements in and over land, description by metes and bounds in each case being on file in the Navy Department:

(a) To the county of Kleberg, Tex., a permanent easement for public highway purposes over a strip of land ten feet wide and approximately three thousand seven hundred and sixty feet long on the south side of the outlying field of the naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Tex.;

(b) To the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., a permanent easement for the construction and maintenance of two 10-inch sludge force mains in and under two strips of land eight feet wide, and twenty-five and one hundred and twenty-five feet long, respectively, within the lands of the United States Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Islais Creek, San Francisco, Calif.;

(c) To the city of San Diego, Calif., a permanent easement for public highway purposes over a strip of land fifteen feet wide and approximately nine hundred and sixty-two feet long adjacent to the east boundary of San Pasqual Street and on the west side of the Sachem housing project (No. Cal-4037-N), San Diego, Calif.; and

(d) To the Public Telephone & Telegraph Co., a permanent easement for telephone line purposes over two strips of land ten feet wide and aggregating approximately six hundred and six feet in length over and across the lands of the naval training and distribution center at Camp Elliott, San Diego County, Calif.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to grant and convey to the Kansas City Power & Light Co. a permanent easement for the erection and maintenance of overhead transmission lines across and over an irregular shaped parcel of land within the boundaries of the Naval Industrial Reserve Aircraft Plant, Kansas City, Mo., containing approximately two and sixty-seven one-hundredths acres, a metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Department of the Navy, the terms and conditions of the grant and conveyance to include the payment therefor of the fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUARTERMASTER EXPERIMENTAL FUEL STATION, PIKE COUNTY, MO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4260) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Department of the Interior the quartermaster experimental fuel station, Pike County, Mo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior, without compensation therefor, for use in connection with the development of synthetic liquid fuels, all that real property and interests therein, comprising approximately 391 acres, known as the quartermaster experimental fuel station in Pike County, Mo., as delineated on map dated July 13, 1948, designated as "Final Project Ownership Map, Quartermaster Experimental Fuel Station," on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and all personal property therein at the time of approval of this act: *Provided*, That at such time as the property herein authorized for transfer is no longer required for the purpose stated, it shall be returned to the Department of the Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY OF REFUGE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, T. H.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1733) to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION OF PASSENGERS AND MERCHANDISE ON CANADIAN VESSELS IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 157) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1952, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation: *Provided*, That such Canadian vessels may transport merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and other ports and points herein enumerated.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING CERTAIN VETERANS' BENEFITS TO HUSBANDS AND WIDOWERS OF FEMALE VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 301) to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the author of the bill if the authorization given by this bill would amount in the ultimate to over \$1,000,000?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am unable to answer that question.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to object to any bills going over. If the gentleman wants the bill to go over he will have to object.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PHARMACISTS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 302) to redefine the eligibility requirements for appointment of pharmacists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (e) (2) of the act of January 3, 1946, as amended (38 U. S. C. 15d), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Pharmacist—

"hold the degree of bachelor of science in pharmacy from a school of pharmacy approved by the Administrator, or have the equivalent of such a degree in experience, and be registered as a pharmacist in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following: "That the requirement of a bachelor of science in pharmacy degree, or its equivalent, to be eligible for appointment or for the purpose of promotion as pharmacist in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration in subsection (e) (2) of section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a Department of Medicine and

Surgery in the Veterans' Administration,' approved January 3, 1946 (59 Stat. 675), is hereby waived in the case of all pharmacists who acquired temporary or indefinite appointments in the Veterans' Administration prior to July 1, 1950, and have performed continuous satisfactory service in the Veterans' Administration up to the date of the enactment of this act.

"Sec. 2. The United States Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to confer competitive civil-service status upon all pharmacists coming within the purview of the foregoing section, without regard to the competitive provisions of the civil-service rules."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENEWAL OF 5-YEAR LEVEL-PREMIUM-TERM INSURANCE FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1072) to amend the existing law to provide the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies of United States Government life insurance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a similar bill to one called a moment ago. It has passed the Congress probably six times and extends the right of veterans of World War I to pick up their insurance and carry it on. This will not cost the Government any money but it does deplete the fund for those veterans who have already converted their insurance and carried it all the way from 5 to 30 years to the extent of \$20,000,000. I feel that this is of such importance the membership should be fully advised before it is extended again because of the amount of money it will take from a great majority of the veterans who have carried their insurance for a long period of time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, I am going to object to passing any of these bills over.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONTROL OF SEA LAMPREYS OF THE GREAT LAKES AREA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2995) to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1945, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the sponsor of this bill explain the position of the agency of the Government which will administer the provisions of it?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously reported by the committee although the report does not ap-

parently indicate that the Fish and Wildlife Service recommends the bill. The Fish and Wildlife Service, I can assure the gentleman, is highly in favor of the legislation and has worked with the committee in bringing the bill to its final conclusion.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I get an explanation of the bill from the author?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill increases the authorization for the research program that is now under way in reference to sea lampreys, which is a parasite on the fish in the Great Lakes.

Mr. STEFAN. What kind of fish?

Mr. POTTER. Lake trout, whitefish, in fact, all types of fish in our Great Lakes waters. I will say to the gentleman that at the present time this parasite has practically destroyed all of the lake trout in Lake Huron.

Mr. STEFAN. This is not a new program?

Mr. POTTER. This is not a new program. It increases the authorization only.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan I know how hard he has worked on getting rid of this pest in our Great Lakes, for which he is to be commended. This sea lamprey has now gotten into some of the waters in the vicinity of the area I represent. I feel that the gentleman is entitled to great credit for his efforts in this matter.

Mr. POTTER. I know the gentleman's interest in conservation and I appreciate his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of the first paragraph of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory sea lampreys of the Great Lakes," approved August 8, 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The cost of the investigations and studies authorized in this section shall not exceed \$359,000 for the first year, \$216,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and \$500,000 for each of the five succeeding fiscal years.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "each of the five succeeding fiscal years" and insert "the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING THE ACT OF AUGUST 7, 1939 (53 STAT. 1243; 48 U. S. C., SEC. 353)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3100) to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the author of the bill, the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]: I note

there is no report from the Bureau of the Budget due to the urgency for this measure, also it is impossible to tell from a reading of the bill the cost. I assume that the cost will be much less than a million dollars; is that correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. There will be no cost whatsoever.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353), be, and is hereby, repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 4, insert: "Sec. 2. Section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214, 1215), as amended (48 U. S. C. 1946 ed., sec. 353), is hereby amended by striking out the following language in the last proviso of that section:

"If any of said sections, or any part thereof, shall be of known mineral character at the date of acceptance of survey thereof, the reservation herein made shall not be effective or applicable, but the entire proceeds or income derived by the United States from such sections 16 and 36 and such section 33 in each township in the Tanana Valley area hereinbefore described, and the minerals therein, together with."

"Sec. 3. Section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214, 1215), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 353), is further amended by adding the following language at the end of the section: 'Nothing in this act shall affect any lands included within the limits of existing reservations of or by the United States, or lands subject to or included in any valid application, claim, or right initiated or held under any laws of the United States unless and until such reservation, application, claim, or right is extinguished, relinquished, or canceled.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSION FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3193) to establish a rate of pension for aid and attendance under part III of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under the rule adopted by the objectors, it appears that this legislation would cost over \$16,000,000, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. RANKIN. As I stated, Mr. Speaker, I am going to object to any of these bills being passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

THREE-YEAR PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3205) to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis develop-

ing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I see nothing in the report or any other data that has been turned over to me indicating the cost of this legislation. Could the gentleman from Mississippi give me the information in that regard?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that my information is that it will cost less than \$1,000,000 the first year, but there is no way of telling exactly how much it will cost.

Mr. FORD. It will be less than \$1,000,000 the first year?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. FORD. But the cumulative cost will be more than \$1,000,000?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know. I cannot tell.

Mr. FORD. I also notice that this legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President. In the light of those facts, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not agree to this bill being passed over. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

REMOVE DEPENDENCY REQUIREMENT IN CERTAIN PENSIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3549) to modify eligibility requirements for payment of pensions to certain widows of veterans of the Civil War, Indian wars, and Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill also is not in line with the directive that the committee has adopted, and therefore I object.

GEOMAGNETIC STATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3830) to authorize the construction and equipment of a geomagnetic station for the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CONTINUANCE OF DIRECT HOUSING LOANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3861) to extend to June 30, 1953, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct home and farmhouse

loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the sponsor of this legislation to explain its provisions, if he will, please.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 3861, of which I am author, provides that the Veterans' Administration be empowered to make direct home and farmhouse loans to veterans of World War II for a period of 2 years, beginning July 1, 1951, which is the date that the present law providing for such loans expires. You will recall that last year we appropriated \$150,000,000 for the purpose of making such loans. It is estimated that by the end of this fiscal year, that is, through June 30 of this year approximately \$120,000,000 of this money will have been used up for the purpose of making direct loans to veterans.

This bill does not call for a new appropriation, and therefore, in the broad sense it can be considered as not placing any new liability on the Treasury of our country. In simple terms, the bill provides that the Veterans' Administration may take the \$30,000,000 which will be left from last year's appropriation, and continue to make direct GI loans with this money. The bill goes further and provides that the Veterans' Administration may sell the mortgages which it presently holds from veterans of World War II, under this program, in the amount of approximately \$120,000,000 and with this money make additional direct loans to World War II veterans in those cases where the need for such direct loans is apparent. Thus, the bill before us, if passed, will be financed with the \$30,000,000 unexpended under the old law, plus such sums as may be acquired by selling all or any part of the approximately \$120,000,000 worth of mortgages that it will hold by July 1, 1951. Every loan made under this program in the past, or in the future, bears or will bear interest at the rate of 4 percent. If the bill before us becomes law, the Veterans' Administration can only sell the mortgages securing the direct loans which it has made in the past, or which it will make in the future, at par, which means for a consideration equal to the unpaid balance plus the accrued interest.

As I see it, this bill, without any new appropriation, and with little or no risk to the Treasury of the United States will keep open the door of opportunity to veterans to buy or build homes for themselves for a period of two additional years.

One of the fundamental weaknesses we have had heretofore in our home and farmhouse loan structure for veterans of World War II has been the inability of veterans who live in rural areas to procure loans through private financial institutions. We were faced with the situation of a veteran living in a city being able to procure through private lending agencies a Government guaranteed GI loan, whereas his cousin, equally qualified under the law for a loan, could

not obtain one because he happened to live in a rural area where private financing was not available. This created an inequitable situation which operated as a discrimination against veterans living in rural areas. It created a problem that only this Government of ours, representing all the people, could solve. The bill before us will do a great deal toward solving the problem.

There are 2,600 counties in the United States that are classified by the Veterans' Administration for the purposes of this program as being wholly or partly rural. In these counties there lives some 4,000,000 veterans of World War II. The Veterans' Administration, upon its investigation has found that private financing in these counties at the reasonable rate of 4 percent interest is not available.

That brings up the question of whether or not 4 percent interest is reasonable. Some people say that it is not reasonable, that 4 percent is not enough. We all recognize that the money market fluctuates. Sometimes money can be had on good security at 2 percent, at other times it might be 5 percent or 6 percent, but I believe we can agree that year in and year out 4 percent is a good interest rate. This bill provides that no loan will be made for more than \$10,000. A \$10,000 loan at 4 percent interest, repaid on a monthly basis over 10 years nets the lender the sum of \$2,150 interest. A \$10,000 loan at 4 percent interest repaid on a monthly basis over a period of 15 years pays the lender \$3,314 interest. A \$10,000 loan at 4 percent interest repaid on a monthly basis over a period of 20 years pays the lender \$4,544 interest. Yes, I think that we can agree that 4 percent is a reasonable rate of interest for most loans of this nature. There will always be some who will want a higher rate of interest. I have heard my father speak about a prevailing interest rate of 25 percent when he was a young man. I recall myself the prevailing rate of 8 percent on most loans in rural north Alabama when I was a young man. The point I am building up to is that if we pass this bill I hope it will have the effect of keeping interest rates on home loans at a reasonable level. The availability of 4 percent home-loan money for veterans of World War II will have a salutary effect on all interest rates, and particularly on home loans.

The passage of this bill will, in my judgment, have another good effect. It will encourage private-lending agencies to extend their operations into the rural areas of our country to a greater extent than they have done before now. There are some who will say that private financing is available wherever it is really needed. Let us examine this contention. In Fayette County, Ala., since the GI bill became law in 1944, there had through November 25, 1950, been a total of nine guaranteed GI loans made by private-lending institutions. In the adjoining county of Lamar there had been a total of six of such loans, an average of about one loan per year. Just to the north in Marion County, Ala., there had been seven guaranteed loans by private-lending agencies. Examples

could be furnished all day. One of the indirect and perhaps unmeasurable benefits of the passage of this bill will be the additional home loans made to veterans in the rural areas of this country by private capital. Of course, none of us want the Government in any kind of business where the need can be furnished by private sources. We do not want our Government competing with private business where it is at all possible to avoid it. But I believe we can agree that a system of direct loans to serve areas such as those that I have cited as examples will be no competition to private money lenders. In those areas there have been no GI loans by private capital. The passage of this bill will not provide competition where no loans have been made before. This bill merely provides a means of allowing veterans of our rural areas to become home owners. Home ownership is our greatest bulwark against the instability of these times. It will be our greatest weapon against instability in the future.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we pass this bill today. I hope that with the explanation made of this bill that my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, will be able to withdraw his reservation of objection. The gentleman is recognized as a true friend of the veteran. He is fair in his approach. He has a job to do here today, and he is always conscientious.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is this a new policy of appropriating money without direct authority of the Congress, or have we followed this policy before?

Mr. ELLIOTT. There is no new authorization contained here, and about the policy with respect to similar loans in past years, I will say to the gentleman from Colorado that I do not know.

Mr. ASPINALL. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 512 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended (1) by striking out clause (C); and (2) by striking out "June 30, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953."

(b) Section 512 (d) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Administrator is authorized to sell, and shall offer for sale, to any private lending institution evidencing ability to service loans, any loan made under this section at a price not less than par; that is, the unpaid balance plus accrued interest, and may guarantee any loan thus sold subject to the same conditions, terms, and limitations which would be applicable were the loan guaranteed under section 501 (b) of this title."

(c) The first sentence of section 513 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of section 512 of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums not in excess of \$150,000,000 (plus the amount of any funds which may have been deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts under subsections (a) and (c) hereof), as the Administrator shall request from time to time except that

no sums may be made available after July 1, 1953."

(d) Section 513 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1954."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "July 1" and insert "June 30."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "July 1" and insert "June 30."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "July 1" and insert "June 30."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3932) to amend subparagraph (a), paragraph I, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide more equitable rates of disability and death compensation for disability or death incurred in service on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (a), paragraph I, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the words "during the dates specified" the words "or in active service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as is fixed by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress."

Sec. 2. Public Law 894, Eighty-first Congress, approved December 28, 1950, is hereby amended by substituting for the words "subparagraph I (c), part II" the words "part I."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as reported by the committee, this bill provides that all men suffering a service-connected disability due to service on or after June 27, 1950, will be entitled to education and training under the provisions of Public Law 16 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. This is the law which applied to World War II training of the same type.

Public Law 894 of the Eighty-first Congress extended this training to men serving after June 27, 1950, who were injured in combat or in extra-hazardous service. The present bill makes it applicable to all service-connected cases.

The Veterans' Administration has been unable to furnish a worth-while estimate of cost, but the committee believes that the proposal is meritorious and the expense, whether large or small, is justified. Significantly, the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the Veterans' Administration report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 8 inclusive.
Page 2, line 1, strike out "Sec. 2." and insert "That."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENEWAL OF CERTAIN INSURANCE FOR WORLD WAR II VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4000) to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level-premium-term insurance for successive 5-year periods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, there is confusion in my mind as to the distinction between this bill and the bill H. R. 1072, which was passed over or objected to earlier on the call of the calendar. H. R. 1072 related to the renewal of 5-year level-premium-term insurance for World War I veterans. In connection with its report the Veterans' Administration stated that it thought the bill would have an adverse effect upon the United States Government life-insurance fund, and that the additional cost to that fund would be about \$22,000,000.

However, as far as this bill, H. R. 4000, is concerned, which relates to the renewal of 5-year level-premium-term insurance for World War II veterans, the Veterans' Administration in its report states that it would not involve any additional cost as far as the Government is concerned and apparently would not have an adverse effect upon the United States Government life-insurance fund.

Since they both relate to the same subject but to different groups of veterans, I am wondering why there should be such diversified reports.

Mr. RANKIN. It would be rather difficult for me to explain this measure fully, for the simple reason that you cannot call the name of the other body on the floor of this House without being subject to a point of order. However, just about the time we entered the Second World War, or in 1940, instead of leaving this legislation to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs somebody at the other end of the avenue introduced a bill, and tacked it onto a bill that came from the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee on Veterans Affairs never saw it. In doing so they denied to World War II veterans some of the privileges that World War I veterans enjoyed, one of which I will say is the total and permanent disability provision.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Maybe it will clarify my question if I ask this question: Is there a real distinction between the purpose of this bill we are now considering, H. R. 4000, and the bill H. R. 1072, which was passed over earlier in the day?

Mr. RANKIN. That one applied to World War I veterans, who had a different policy. This applies to World War II veterans. The Administration says it

will not impose any material additional cost on the Government.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As I understand it, then, the insurance is handled differently as far as those two groups of veterans are concerned; therefore, we can say that the two bills are very definitely distinct one from the other?

Mr. RANKIN. Absolutely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first proviso of subsection (f) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "Provided, That at the expiration of any term period any national service life insurance policy which has not been exchanged or converted to a permanent plan of insurance, may be renewed as level premium term insurance for a successive period of 5 years at the premium rate for the then attained age without medical examination, provided the required premiums are tendered prior to the expiration of such term."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING VETERANS WITH 40-PERCENT DISABILITY ELIGIBLE FOR ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4108) to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), as amended, to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 40 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this seems to be a very laudable bill and one which I am satisfied the Congress would pass with probably everyone voting for it if it came up in the regular order under a rule.

However, the report from the Veterans' Administration shows that the first-year cost of this bill would be almost \$17,000,000, with no estimate of the total cost, and since the rules governing the Consent Calendar bar any bill involving more than a million dollars from being considered on that calendar, I am compelled to ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we cannot agree to these bills going over without prejudice.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill for the reasons stated.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 877 of the Eightieth Congress provided additional compensation for service-connected veterans who had dependents and who were 60 percent or more

disabled. By Public Law 339, the disability was reduced to 50 percent.

This bill would further reduce the requirement to 40 percent. For example, a veteran 40 percent disabled under today's disability compensation schedule would receive \$60 per month compensation. If he had a wife, he would receive 40 percent of \$21 additional, if this bill should be enacted into law.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that the first-year cost would be approximately \$16,000,000.

AUTOMOBILES FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4233) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans or cash payments in lieu thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. PRIEST]. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, this is a very meritorious piece of legislation, but in view of the policy adopted by the committee of objectors and the cost of this bill indicating that it will be over \$27,000,000, I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have to object to the bill being passed over. If the gentleman wants to object to its present consideration, let him object.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

INCREASING INCOME LIMITATIONS FOR PAYMENT OF NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4387) to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents, and to preclude exclusions in determining annual income for purposes of such limitations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill likewise goes over the cost limitation set by the committee of objectors, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we cannot agree to the bill going over without prejudice.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE IN COMPENSATION AND PENSION RATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4394) to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we cannot agree for these bills to go over.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

EXPANDING AUTHORITY OF THE COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1025) to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 81 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the word "possessions," the phrase "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands," so that the sentence will read as follows: "Such aids to navigation other than loran stations shall be established and operated only within the United States, its Territories and possessions, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States at places where naval or military bases of the United States are or may be located, and at other places where such aids to navigation have been established prior to June 26, 1948."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING COMPLETION TIME ON DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4338) to extend the time for completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Delaware, by and through its State highway department, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.," approved July 13, 1946, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The authority hereby granted shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction of said bridge and its approaches be commenced within 3 years and completed within 6 years from July 13, 1946."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARK IN HAWAII

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 93, the bill (H. R. 1733) to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, earlier in the day I asked that this bill go over without prejudice pending the appearance of some Member who might be able to explain one matter in connection with this bill.

There appears in the report filed by the Bureau of the Budget, the following language:

It is the President's policy to curtail new activities which do not contribute to the defense effort. Therefore, in the event of the enactment of the bill appropriation estimates for maintenance of this park should be held in abeyance until such time as conditions warrant consideration of additional items of expense of this character.

The question which occurs to me is this. If we are not going to incur any expenditure in connection with the purchase of this property or in connection with the maintenance of it until some future date when our fiscal picture is brighter than it is today, I wonder why we should commit ourselves at this point to take on this obligation in the future. Why not wait and see what our situation is at that time.

I wonder, in other words, if we would not be better off to simply defer action on this until these conditions mentioned by the Bureau of the Budget are met at some future date?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would be very happy to answer that, but before I do so I would like to call on the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. CRAWFORD] who can give a better answer.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would be very glad to have either one of the gentlemen explain.

Mr. ASPINALL. In the committee which handled this bill it was agreed that this was perhaps one of the most historic sites in Hawaii and that a background of policy should at this time be established so that those who have private interests around this area would know what the wishes of the Congress might be. It was also agreed by the Delegate from Hawaii that there would be no request for funds until the present international emergency was taken care of.

It appeared to us, in order to save this historic site, which amounts to a place of refuge, so far as history is concerned, of all the oppressed people of Hawaii, this bill should be passed, and that it is a very laudable undertaking.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In other words, as I understand it, the committee feels that by passing this authorization legislation at this time we will be preserving this area so that when the Congress does decide it is expedient to step in and maintain this park the property will be available for that purpose.

Mr. ASPINALL. The distinguished gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, when title to such lands located on the island of Hawaii, within the following-described area, as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, in the exercise of his judgment and discretion as necessary and suitable for the purpose, shall have been vested in the United States, said lands shall be set apart as the

City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, for the benefit and inspiration of the people:

PARCEL 1

Being all of R. P. 3306, L. C. Aw. 7219, Apana 2 to Kaliae, all of L. C. Aw. 9470 to Muki, and portions of R. P. 7874, L. C. Aw. 11216 Apana 34 to M. Kekauonohi (Ahupuaa of Honaunau), and R. P. 6852, L. C. Aw. 7712 Apana 1 to M. Kekuananoa (Ahupuaa of Keokea).

Beginning at a one and one-half-inch pipe in concrete monument called "Kalani", at the southeast corner of this parcel, the northeast corner of parcel 3, and on the common boundary of the lands of Keokea and Kiliae, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being seven thousand four hundred forty-four and eight-tenths feet south and five thousand three and two-tenths feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Seventy-nine degrees thirty-three minutes fifteen seconds six hundred and eighty feet along the land of Kiliae, L. C. Aw. 8521-B to G. D. Hueu and passing over a rock called "Kuwaia", marked K+K at six hundred seventy-three and two-tenths feet to high-water mark; thence along high-water mark, along seacoast for the next three courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points at seacoast being:

2. One hundred and thirty-five degrees fifty-one minutes three thousand nine hundred seventy-six and one-tenth feet;

3. One hundred and fifty-two degrees twenty-five minutes one thousand and seventy-eight feet;

4. Two hundred and forty degrees fifty-five minutes one thousand two hundred four and four-tenths feet;

5. Three hundred and fifty-four degrees nine minutes two hundred twenty-four and one-tenth feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216: 34 to M. Kekauonohi, along stone wall and old trail;

6. Two hundred and sixty degrees fifty-four minutes one hundred seventy-five and nine-tenths feet across old trail along stone wall to a "+" on rock;

7. One hundred and fifty-eight degrees six minutes seventy-two feet along L. C. Aw. 7296 to Puhi, along stone wall;

8. Two hundred and sixty degrees thirty-six minutes ninety and seven-tenths feet along stone wall;

9. One hundred and ninety-four degrees ten minutes sixty-two and nine-tenths feet along stone wall along L. C. Aw. 7295 and 6979-B: 2 to Keolewa;

10. One hundred and seventy-five degrees fifty-four minutes twenty-six and nine-tenths feet along stone wall;

11. Two hundred and fifteen degrees thirty-seven minutes forty-seven and four-tenths feet along stone wall along remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216: 34 to M. Kekauonohi;

12. One hundred and seventy-two degrees twenty-eight minutes forty-eight and one-tenth feet along same;

13. Two hundred and twenty-six degrees twenty-three minutes two hundred twenty-eight and eight-tenths feet along remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216: 34 to M. Kekauonohi to the south side of fifty-foot road;

14. Two hundred and sixty-four degrees fifty-one minutes one hundred fifteen and two-tenths feet along the south side of fifty-foot road;

15. Two hundred and fifty-two degrees thirteen minutes two hundred and two-tenths feet along same;

16. Two hundred and eighty-six degrees thirty minutes one hundred seventy and nine-tenths feet along same;

17. Two hundred and thirty-eight degrees twenty-five minutes ninety-two and eight-tenths feet along same;

18. Two hundred and twenty-three degrees one minute one hundred fourteen and four-tenths feet along same;

19. Three hundred and thirty-eight degrees forty-nine minutes thirty seconds four thousand nine hundred eighty and three-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216: 34 to M. Kekauonohi and L. C. Aw. 7712: 1 to M. Kekauonohi and passing over a one and one-fourth-inch pipe in concrete monument at one thousand four hundred eighty-one and six-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

Area, one hundred sixty-six and ninety one-hundredths acres.

PARCEL 2

Being portions of L. C. Aw. 11216 Apana 34 to M. Kekauonohi R. P. 7874 (Ahupuaa of Honaunau).

Beginning at a pipe in concrete at the northeast corner of this parcel, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being two thousand one hundred thirty-nine feet south and eleven thousand six hundred seventeen and nine-tenths feet east and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Three hundred fifty-eight degrees twenty-three minutes two hundred sixty and four-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216: 34 to M. Kekauonohi;

2. Ninety-three degrees thirty minutes two hundred and sixty-nine feet along same, along stone wall, along lot 2 of the subdivision by B. P. Bishop estate;

3. Eighty-two degrees no minutes three hundred and eighteen feet along same to the east side of fifty-foot road;

Thence along the east side of fifty-foot road, the direct azimuth and distance being: one hundred seventy-one degrees twenty minutes two hundred ninety-one and five-tenths feet;

5. Two hundred and seventy degrees no minutes six hundred and twenty feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216: 34 to M. Kekauonohi to the point of beginning.

Area, three and seventy one-hundredths acres.

Together with an easement six feet wide for a pipeline right-of-way extending from the Government road to parcel 1, the south side of said right-of-way being described as follows:

Beginning at the east end of this right-of-way on the common boundary of the lands of Honaunau and Keokea, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being three thousand one hundred ninety and eight-tenths feet south and eleven thousand seventy-eight and eight-tenths feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Eighty degrees thirty-six minutes five sections one hundred and seventeen feet along L. C. Aw. 7712: 1 to M. Kekuananoa, to the Triangulation Station "Ahupuaa" of the B. P. Bishop estate;

2. Eighty-two degrees twenty minutes seven thousand two hundred eighty-nine and one-tenth feet along same to a one and one-fourth pipe in concrete monument on the east boundary of parcel 1 the coordinates of said point of the end of this six-foot right-of-way referred to Government Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being four thousand one hundred eighty-two and four-tenths feet south and three thousand seven hundred thirty-nine and four-tenths feet east.

Area, one and two one-hundredths acres.

PARCEL 3

Being portion of L. C. Aw. 8521-B to G. D. Hueu, being portion of the Ahupuaa of Kiliae.

Beginning at a one and one-half-inch pipe in concrete monument called Kalani at the northeast corner of this parcel, the southeast corner of parcel 1, on the common boundary of the lands of Keokea and Kiliae,

the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being seven thousand four hundred forty-four and eight-tenths feet south and five thousand three and two-tenths feet east and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Three hundred thirty eight degrees forty-nine minutes thirty seconds five hundred ninety-five and four-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 8521-B to G. D. Hueu to the eight thousand foot south co-ordinates line referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni";

2. Ninety degrees no minutes one thousand ninety-nine and seven-tenths feet along same and along said eight thousand foot south coordinates line and across school grant 7 Apana 6 to high-water mark;

3. Thence along high-water mark, along sea, the direct azimuth and distance being: two hundred six degrees thirty-three minutes thirty seconds four hundred eighty-two and nine-tenths feet;

4. Two hundred fifty-nine degrees thirty-three minutes fifteen seconds six hundred eighty feet along L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa and passing over a rock called Kuwala, marked K+K at six and eight-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

Area, ten and twenty-five one-hundredths acres.

Sec. 2. Upon the vesting of title in the United States to such lands as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior as necessary and suitable for historical park purposes in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of this act, the City of Refuge National Historical Park shall be established by order of the said Secretary, which shall be published in the Federal Register. Any other lands within the area described above shall become a part of the national historical park upon the vesting of title thereto in the United States and upon publication of an appropriate supplemental order by the said Secretary in the Federal Register.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to procure, by donation, purchase, or otherwise, with any funds that may be available for that purpose, lands and interests in lands which may be needed for the City of Refuge National Historical Park within the area described in section 1 hereof.

Sec. 4. In order to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior in consolidating in Federal ownership lands within the area described above, and to facilitate acquisition of the lands needed for the national historical park, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii is also authorized to acquire lands for said park, at the expense of the Territory of Hawaii by exchange or otherwise, in accordance with procedure prescribed by the act of February 27, 1920 (41 Stat. 452).

Sec. 5. The City of Refuge National Historical Park shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 1-4), as amended and supplemented, and such additional authority compatible therewith as is contained in the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 461-467), with regard to preservation of historic sites and objects of national significance.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 9, line 8, strike out the words "donation, purchase, or otherwise" and insert "donation or purchase."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

XCVII—421

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). This completes the call of the calendar.

SUSPENDING APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYMENT OF AN ATTORNEY BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement submitted by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], we will continue the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 70.

The committee amendment has been reported and is now pending.

Mr. FORD. It is my understanding that it is agreeable to the Committee on the Judiciary that the committee amendment be withdrawn, and that the bill as originally introduced be voted on at this time. Is that correct?

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment may be withdrawn, and Senate Joint Resolution 70 be approved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I object. Is not that resolution before the Rules Committee at this time? Does not that relate to the Nimitz committee?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. May the Chair state that permission for consideration had been granted earlier in the day. The question now is on the request of the gentleman from Michigan to withdraw the committee amendment at the present time.

Mr. FORD. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] that by withdrawing the committee amendment we are actually deleting from the resolution the portion pertaining to the Nimitz Commission.

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. It still leaves that part the gentleman is interested in before the Committee on Rules, and simply puts through the other part to which there is no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Just a minute; let us understand this thing. What is left in the bill?

Mr. WALTER. There is left in the bill, if the gentleman will yield to me, authority with respect to the employment by a committee of the Senate of a clerk. That bill passed the Senate some time ago, but when it came to the House it was amended by including a bill that had passed the House which was not considered in the Senate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This Senate joint resolution has been pending before the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from New York was the only Member heard on it. I understand other Members desire to be heard on it. I think this is rather an unusual action to bring the measure up at this time, and I hope that it will not be approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the Senate joint resolution will be read a third time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting]. Ninety-one Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 78]

Aandahl	Gore	Morgan
Abbitt	Granahan	Morris
Allen, Calif.	Green	Morrison
Allen, La.	Hall	Morton
Andrews	Leonard W.	Murphy
Anfuso	Hand	Murray, Wis.
Auchincloss	Harrison, Va.	O'Brien, Mich.
Barden	Hart	O'Konski
Battle	Havener	O'Neill
Belcher	Hébert	O'Toole
Bender	Heffernan	Patman
Boggs, Del.	Heller	Patten
Breen	Herlong	Philbin
Brooks	Herter	Pickett
Brownson	Hoffman, Ill.	Powell
Buckley	Irving	Preston
Byrnes, N. Y.	Jackson, Wash.	Quinn
Camp	Javits	Ramsay
Carnahan	Johnson	Reed, Ill.
Case	Jonas	Reed, N. Y.
Chatham	Jones	Richards
Chelf	Hamilton C.	Rivers
Chiperfield	Jones	Rooney
Chudoff	Woodrow W.	Roosevelt
Clemente	Judd	Sabath
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	St. George
Cotton	Kearns	Schwabe
Coudert	Keiley, Pa.	Scott, Hardie
Crosser	Kelly, N. Y.	Scudder
Dawson	Kennedy	Shafer
DeGraffenried	Keogh	Short
Dingell	Kirwan	Sikes
Donohue	Klein	Smith, Wis.
Donovan	Lane	Spence
Durham	Lantaff	Stanley
Eaton	Latham	Steed
Evins	LeCompte	Stigler
Fallon	Lesinski	Taylor
Fellows	Lyle	Teague
Fine	McGregor	Towe
Flood	McVey	Vail
Frazier	Madden	Weichel
Fulton	Magee	Wheeler
Furcolo	Mansfield	Wigglesworth
Garmatz	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Gary	Morrow	Wood, Ga.
Gillette	Miller, Calif.	Woodruff
Goodwin	Miller, N. Y.	
Gordon	Morano	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 290 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUSPENDING APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO EMPLOYMENT OF ATTORNEY BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair state the parliamentary situation at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As amended?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment was defeated on a voice vote.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then the question is on the resolution, without section 2?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution without the committee amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Without section 2?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided; and there were—ayes 44, noes 56.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The roll call is automatic. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 120, nays 164, not voting 148, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—120

Addonizio	Gossett	Passman
Aspinall	Granger	Perkins
Bailey	Grant	Polk
Baring	Greenwood	Price
Barrett	Gregory	Priest
Bates, Ky.	Harris	Rabaut
Beckworth	Hays, Ark.	Rains
Bennett, Fla.	Hays, Ohio	Reams
Bentsen	Hedrick	Redden
Blatnik	Holfield	Regan
Boggs, La.	Howell	Rhodes
Bolling	Jarman	Ribicoff
Bonner	Jones, Ala.	Riley
Bosone	Jones, Mo.	Roberts
Boykin	Karsten, Mo.	Rodino
Brown, Ga.	Kerr	Rogers, Colo.
Bryson	Kilday	Rogers, Tex.
Burnside	King	Secret
Cannon	Kluczynski	Shelley
Carlyle	Lanham	Sheppard
Celler	Lantaff	Sikes
Combs	Larcade	Smith, Miss.
Cooley	Lind	Staggers
Cooper	McCarthy	Sutton
Davis, Tenn.	McGrath	Tackett
Deane	McGuire	Thomas
Delaney	McKinnon	Thompson, Tex.
Denton	McMillan	Thornberry
Dollinger	McMullen	Trimble
Dorn	Machrowicz	Vinson
Doyle	Mack, Ill.	Walter
Eberharter	Mahon	Watts
Elliott	Marshall	Welch
Engle	Mills	Whitaker
Feighan	Mitchell	Wickersham
Fernandez	Moulder	Willis
Fisher	Multer	Wilson, Tex.
Fogarty	Murdock	Yates
Forand	O'Brien, Ill.	Yorty
Gathings	O'Brien, Mich.	Zablocki

NAYS—164

Abernethy	Angell	Beamer
Adair	Arends	Bennett, Mich.
Allen, Ill.	Armstrong	Berry
Andersen,	Ayres	Betts
H. Carl	Baker	Bishop
Anderson, Calif.	Bakewell	Blackney
Andresen,	Bates, Mass.	Boggs, Del.
August H.	Beall	Boiton

Bow	Hale	Potter
Bramblett	Hall,	Poulson
Bray	Edwin Arthur	Prouty
Brehm	Harden	Radwan
Brown, Ohio	Hardy	Rankin
Budge	Harrison, Wyo.	Reece, Tenn.
Burdick	Harvey	Rees, Kans.
Burleson	Heselton	Riehlman
Burton	Hess	Robeson
Busbey	Hill	Rogers, Fla.
Bush	Hillings	Rogers, Mass.
Butler	Hinshaw	Sadiak
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Saylor
Canfield	Hoffman, Mich.	Scott,
Chenoweth	Holmes	Hugh D., Jr.
Church	Hope	Scrivner
Clevenger	Horan	Seely-Brown
Cole, Kans.	Hull	Sheehan
Colmer	Jackson, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.
Corbett	James	Simpson, Pa.
Cox	Jenison	Sittler
Crawford	Jenkins	Smith, Kans.
Crumpacker	Jensen	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	Kean	Springer
Curtis, Mo.	Keating	Stefan
Curtis, Nebr.	Kerstein, Wis.	Stockman
Dague	Kilburn	Taber
Davis, Ga.	Lovre	Talle
Davis, Wis.	Lucas	Thompson,
Denny	McConnell	Mich.
Devereux	McCulloch	Tollefson
D'Ewart	McDonough	Van Pelt
Dolliver	Mack, Wash.	Van Zandt
Dondero	Martin, Iowa	Vaughn
Doughton	Martin, Mass.	Velde
Ellsworth	Miller, Md.	Vorys
Elston	Miller, Nebr.	Vursell
Fenton	Morano	Werdell
Ford	Mumma	Wharton
Forrester	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Fugate	Nelson	Widnall
Gamble	Nicholson	Williams, Miss.
Gavin	Norblad	Williams, N. Y.
George	Norrell	Winstead
Golden	O'Hara	Withrow
Graham	Ostertag	Wolcott
Gross	Patterson	Wood, Idaho
Gwinn	Phillips	
Hagen	Poage	

NOT VOTING—148

Aandahl	Gore	Morgan
Abbitt	Granahan	Morris
Albert	Green	Morrison
Allen, Calif.	Hall,	Morton
Allen, La.	Leonard W.	Murphy
Andrews	Halleck	Murray, Wis.
Anfuso	Hand	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Harrison, Va.	O'Neill
Barden	Hart	O'Toole
Battle	Havenner	Patman
Belcher	Hébert	Patten
Bender	Heffernan	Philbin
Breen	Heller	Pickett
Brooks	Herlong	Powell
Brownson	Herter	Preston
Buckley	Hoffman, Ill.	Quinn
Buffett	Hunter	Ramsay
Byrne, N. Y.	Irving	Reed, Ill.
Camp	Jackson, Wash.	Reed, N. Y.
Carnahan	Javits	Richards
Case	Johnson	Rivers
Chatham	Jonas	Rooney
Chelf	Jones,	Roosevelt
Chipfield	Hamilton C.	Sabath
Chudoff	Jones,	St. George
Clemente	Woodrow W.	Sasser
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Schwabe
Cotton	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Coudert	Kearns	Scudder
Crosser	Kelley, Pa.	Shafer
Dawson	Kelly, N. Y.	Short
DeGraffenried	Kennedy	Sieminski
Dempey	Keogh	Smith, Wis.
Dingell	Kirwan	Spence
Donohue	Klein	Stanley
Donovan	Lane	Steed
Durham	Latham	Stigler
Eaton	LeCompte	Taylor
Evins	Lesinski	Teague
Fallon	Lyle	Towe
Fellows	McCormack	Vall
Fine	McGregor	Weichel
Flood	McVey	Wheeler
Frazier	Madden	Wier
Fulton	Magee	Wigglesworth
Furcolo	Mansfield	Wilson, Ind.
Garmatz	Mason	Wolverton
Gary	Meador	Wood, Ga.
Gillette	Merron	Woodruff
Goodwin	Miller, Calif.	
Gordon	Miller, N. Y.	

So the Senate joint resolution was not agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Havenner for, with Mr. Allen of California against.

Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. LeCompte against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Wolverton against.

Mr. Flood for, with Mr. Towe against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Breen for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Magee for, with Mr. Buffett against.

Mr. Jackson of Washington for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Murphy for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Mrs. Kelly of New York for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Jonas against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Hand against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Gillette against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. McGregor against.

Mr. Clemente for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Teague for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Mansfield for, with Mr. Goodwin against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Fellows against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Chipfield against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Bender against.

Mr. deGraffenried for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Fine for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. McVey against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Vall against.

Mr. Chudoff for, with Mr. Wheeler against.

Mr. Green for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr. Granahan for, with Mr. Gary against.

Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Harrison of Virginia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Battle with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Cotton.
Mr. Sasser with Mr. Schwabe.
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Wier with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. HALE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HAGEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

On motion of Mr. Brown of Ohio, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

T. L. MORROW

Mr. CELLER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of T. L. Morrow.

FREE POSTAGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE
ARMED FORCES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4393) to extend for 2 years the period during which free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea and other specified areas shall be in effect.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas," approved July 12, 1950 (Public Law 609, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

By unanimous consent a second was considered as ordered.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1950, an act was approved providing free first-class mail privileges sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States while on active duty or in the active service of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea, and such other areas as the President of the United States might hereafter designate as combat zones or areas of military operations to any person in the United States including the Territories and possessions thereof.

The legislation also provided that the free mailing privileges above-granted should become effective upon the date of enactment of this act and should continue until June 30, 1950, unless terminated at an earlier date by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by direction of the President.

The bill before the House for consideration merely amends this act so as to strike out "June 30, 1951" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953." We hope of course that the war in Korea may be brought to a successful conclusion long before that time, but there must be some termination date inserted by the amendment, for the present act expires on June 30 of this year. I am sure every Member of this House is highly in favor of continuing the present free first-class mail privilege to the members of our Armed Forces in Korea.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has the unanimous approval of all the members of the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. There was no objection on the part of anyone who came before our committee. It is needed legislation; it is fair and will, I am sure, have the unanimous approval of the membership of this House.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I ask the gentleman from Kansas if the President has taken any action to designate certain theaters of operation so that the boys will have the frank under this amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, this particular legislation has not yet been

approved. It is merely extension of present law.

Mr. CANFIELD. I understood that the bill amended existing law by continuing it further.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is right. It continues existing law.

Mr. CANFIELD. My question now is whether the President has designated any areas under the former law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Only the Korean area so far as I am informed.

Mr. CANFIELD. How about the boys serving, for instance, in Japan in the army of occupation?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am quite sure they will be included, along with Korea as a part of the theater of operation.

Mr. CANFIELD. How about the boys serving in Germany in the army of occupation?

Mr. REES of Kansas. They will be included under this bill only if Germany is declared a theater of operation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that during the Second World War all members of the Armed Forces had this privilege?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. CANFIELD. They do not have it today, do they?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. CANFIELD. They will not have it in the United States under this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; they will not under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of the Members for this legislation, without which the free mailing privilege of our troops in Korea would expire on the 30th of this month. I am informed that this mail service for the troops is working out entirely satisfactorily and that all mail sent from Korea is sent by air to this country. With such vast distances to cover it is virtually a necessity that mail go by air.

I have received a large volume of mail from people all over the country urging a reduction in the air parcel post rates for parcels they send to their sons fighting in Korea. Much of this mail comes to me since I introduced a bill which would reduce the present air parcel post rates by 50 percent for those parcels weighing less than 5 pounds addressed for delivery to military personnel in Korea. My bill, H. R. 3742, should receive priority for early consideration.

I realize the Post Office Department is operating at a deficit, but, in my judgment, it is much more equitable to reduce the postal rate on parcels weighing less than 5 pounds going to troops in Korea than to continue to pay increased subsidy for second- and third-class mail which are now being carried at a large deficit. For example, in second-class mail we are paying \$20,000,000 more in subsidies this year than was paid last year. The cost of my bill would be only a fraction of this increased cost we are bearing for people who are receiving their newspapers and magazines and can read them in the comfort of their own homes. Furthermore, the cost of my bill would be a mere fraction of the \$135,000,000 in subsidies which we paid for the handling of circulars and advertising matter sent through the mail last year as third-class mail.

My bill would not increase the postal deficit for the reason that the Post Office Department is not charged for carrying these parcels beyond the ports of embarkation. Such transportation is furnished by the Air Force in most instances.

During the last war, for example, the Department realized in 1 year—1945—approximately \$90,000,000 in profit on air mail going to our men in the Armed Forces. The reason for this profit is that they do not have the expensive distribution costs that they pay in the individual delivery on other mail.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse the remarks of the two leaders of this committee, and commend especially the distinguished chairman for his remark that we all hope this war in Korea may be brought to a successful conclusion before the 2 years have expired. I think most of us would have been more gratified had he added that this war be brought to a successful conclusion with victory.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thomas Mann, the eminent German author, is one of the world's most renowned literary luminaries and a resident of the district which I have the honor to represent. On the rise of Adolf Hitler, Mr. Mann sought, and was granted, political refuge in this country. It was presumed that in seeking sanctuary Mr. Mann sought not only to escape the slavery which Hitlerism would have imposed upon artists and other independent thinkers everywhere, but every other form of degradation and intellectual bondage as well.

However, with the passage of the years, it has become increasingly evident that the Stalinist form of physical and mental bondage holds no terrors for my distinguished constituent. To the contrary, Mr. Mann has become one of the world's foremost apologists for Stalin and company. Politically, Mr. Mann indicates a preference for those on the far left, and he rarely misses an occasion to eulogize the mental strait-jacket performances of fellow apologists.

On May 22, 1951, Mr. Mann sent warm and cordial birthday greetings to an east-German Stalinist literary hack by the name of Becher. Mr. Becher's chief claim to fame would appear to be his consistent ability to tongue the boots of his political superiors. An example of Becher's literary capacity and intellectual honesty appears at par when he says, "How happy must be the letter 'T' as it is permitted to form a letter in the name of Stalin."

While none will deny that Mr. Mann is a literary giant, many will question his good judgment and his political wisdom. Some may even go so far as to question his loyalty to the principles of personal freedom of action under the law. Mr. Mann, under the laws governing our free society here in these United

States, has the high privilege of existence under the Stars and Stripes. He is permitted a sacred and envied space in the ranks of free men and women who are devoted to individual liberty, and who mean to maintain that liberty at the cost of what Winston Churchill called blood, sweat, and tears. Thousands of lives have already been lost in the mortal struggle against international communism and the leaders of that godless crusade. Mr. Becher is an artist whose devotion to Stalin and to communism is unquestioned and universally accepted. The American people do not share Mr. Mann's high regard for Mr. Becher, and the way of life to which he pays such high tribute. Our eminent guest within the gates of what we Americans consider to be a land of liberty and justice, will do well to lard his obvious sympathies for communism and Communists with a few strips of common sense and common gratitude. Mr. Mann should remember that guests who complain about the fare at the table of their host are seldom invited to another meal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the June issue of New Leader magazine, titled "Thomas Mann and the Commissar." The article by Eugene Tillinger should receive the thoughtful consideration of every citizen dedicated to the maintenance of intellectual honesty and moral integrity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CHIEF OF ARMY ENGINEERS LOBBIES FOR THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I had occasion recently to call the attention of the House to the lobbying activities of the Army engineers in connection with the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Now, I want to call attention to a statement credited to Major General Pick, Chief of the Army Engineers, which should be of interest to every Member of this body.

I have in my hand an article from the June 5 issue of the Ogdensburg (N. Y.) Journal. It is written by Fred G. Eaton of that staff and it describes a dinner given at Cornwall, Ontario, to the members of the House Public Works Committee who recently made an inspection trip of the proposed St. Lawrence project. At this dinner, speeches were made by the committee chairman, Mr. BUCKLEY of New York, by General Pick, and presumably by others. The writer is somewhat critical of the delivery of the

chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, but I shall not go into that. Here is what he said of General Pick:

General Pick was much quieter and more effective. In his mild southern drawl, the general made the point most effectively.

Then Mr. Eaton proceeds to quote General Pick as follows:

"Any group or individual who allows selfish interests or motives to destroy these two great nations will have to answer to his own Maker," the chief of engineers declared.

Mr. Eaton said:

And that is just what anyone who opposes the seaway is doing, he believes.

Then directly quoting General Pick again, Mr. Eaton proceeds:

We must have steel to take care of our oncoming needs. We need this waterway. We can't get sufficient steel without it and I will stake my reputation as an engineer and truthful person on that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to Mr. Eaton's statement—

And that is just what anyone who opposes the seaway is doing, he—General Pick—believes.

In other words, General Pick believes that those of us who oppose this economic monstrosity are "allowing selfish interests or motives to destroy" the United States and Canada.

Mr. Eaton does not give General Pick's own words to justify the statement that this is what the general believes, but I am told by those who heard him, that his words fully justified Mr. Eaton's conclusion.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that General Pick is referring to a majority of the Members of this body who oppose the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. As a matter of fact, General Pick is deliberately insulting them and I think it is time he should be called to account.

In passing I think we should also be interested in General Pick's statement that he will stake his reputation as an engineer and truthful person on the need of the waterway to get sufficient steel for this country.

In the light of the indisputable facts, I think we may well question both his reputation as an engineer and truthful person, because the promoters of the Labrador-Quebec ore reserves have said time and again, that they plan to bring in 10,000,000 tons of ore a year by 1957 over present transportation facilities and this justifies their investment.

These selfish promoters contend they need the subsidized waterway to bring in an additional 10,000,000 tons 20 years from now on a competitive basis with other iron ores at midwest steel centers. This 20,000,000 tons is the capacity of the 360-mile railroad which they are having to build through the Canadian wilds. They have no plans for a greater capacity, yet General Pick wants to build them a waterway that in the final analysis would cost American taxpayers more than a billion dollars. This 20,000,000 tons will compare with the more than 125,000,000 tons of ore we will be using 20 years from now; indeed, it is about the amount we are using now.

Mr. Speaker, the great majority of the steel operators, those who produce 75 percent of this country's steel, are not interested in the Labrador-Quebec ore or in the St. Lawrence waterway.

I suppose General Pick is applying his engineering knowledge against the statement of Mr. Fairless of United States Steel, that the steel industry faces no ore scarcity, and that of Mr. Eugene Grace, of Bethlehem Steel Co., that the St. Lawrence seaway is not essential to bringing in Labrador-Quebec ore.

As I have said many times before, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is being sought by only five of the smaller steel companies who have invested in the Canadian project and who produce only 25 percent of the country's steel, and with them it is strictly a proposition of competition in marketing their ores, not one of meeting an ore scarcity.

Mr. Eaton's article in the June 5, 1951, issue of the Ogdensburg (N. Y.) Journal, follows:

JUNKETING CONGRESSMEN BOOST SEAWAY IN CORNWALL SPEECHES

Iron ore and steel. Iron ore and steel.

This theme was repeated like strokes on an anvil as speaker after speaker endorsed the St. Lawrence seaway last night at Cornwall.

The occasion was a dinner for members of the House Public Works Committee who are touring the site of the proposed seaway development.

Representative CHARLES BUCKLEY, Democrat, New York, chairman of the committee, declared it would be "seaway and power project or nothing." Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army Engineers, implied that such a stand was needlessly dogmatic. But both hammered at the necessity for the seaway so that the United States and Canada would have sufficient iron ore.

They were talking about the iron ore fields that have been discovered in Labrador, huge deposits which could easily meet the needs of both nations—if the ore can be economically transported to the steel industry of the Midwest.

BUCKLEY, one-time foe of the project, described the committee's visit to the Mesabi range, prime source of iron ore today. He declared that he was convinced that the high-grade ore would not last more than "7 or 8 years."

Thus if the seaway is not built, the United States and Canada will run short of steel upon which their economy is based.

But, he shouted, "it will be seaway and power or nothing." This was a slap at the repeated requests of the Dewey administration to go ahead and develop the power jointly with the Province of Ontario.

BUCKLEY said that "most of my committee wants what I want. They want the seaway and they want the power."

The committee will vote on sending seaway legislation to the House for consideration on its return to Washington.

BUCKLEY was loud in his convictions, using all the tricks of the politician to influence his audience. One would have thought he was addressing the House, instead of an international group gathered for dinner.

General Pick was much quieter and more effective. In his mild southern drawl, the general made the point most effectively.

"Any group or individual who allows selfish interests or motives to destroy these two great nations will have to answer to his own maker," the Chief of Engineers declared.

And that is just what anyone who opposes the seaway is doing, he believes.

"We must have steel to take care of our oncoming needs. We need this waterway."

We can't get sufficient steel without it and I will stake my reputation as an engineer and truthful person on that."

He continued that the steel industry could be moved east of the Appalachians and gather its ores from Venezuela and from Labrador by sea, but he pointed out the vast economic dislocation that would result.

His voice sharpened as he concluded:

"The chairman (BUCKLEY) said all or nothing. That isn't, in my opinion, good enough to last us 50 years."

Mr. Speaker, in the city of Omaha, Nebr., General Pick, Chief of the Army Engineers, is continuing his lobbying activities at the expense of the American taxpayers. General Pick is appearing before the First Governor's Conference of Inland America at Omaha, Nebr., a conference financed by the M. A. Hanna Steel Co., one of the five small Midwest steel companies advocating the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

It is interesting to note that no one has been invited to the Governor's Conference unless he favors the St. Lawrence project.

SPAIN

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, recently in the debate on the wheat-for-India legislation, Speaker RAYBURN emphasized the fact that we need friends all over the world. I heartily agree with his statement.

Therefore, I cannot understand why the administration continues to resist making a friend and ally of Spain. A nation which is definitely anti-Communist and which has indicated willingness to join the United States in the defense of liberty-loving countries of the world.

In a recent speech in Detroit, Spain's Ambassador, José de Lequerica, stated that—

Spain is prepared to resist the Communist aggressors and to contribute the necessary military force which, in union with others, will create such a mass of dynamic force * * * that they (the Reds) will be little inclined to carry through their plans.

Why Spain is not given more consideration by the State Department I am unable to say. Last September a loan of \$65,000,000 was approved by the Congress. However, I understand that only one-third of that amount has been granted.

Certainly Spain should be taken into the proposed military defense assistance program, the ECA, and the point 4 program. They would be a logical and valuable ally.

In my report of January 22, 1951, on my European trip, I stated:

I am thoroughly convinced that the defense of Western Europe requires the immediate participation of Spain and the utilization of strategic air bases in that country. From a military standpoint we cannot afford longer to neglect so valuable a potential ally as Spain. I hope that the exchange of Ambassadors between the two countries will be followed, in the near future, by the inclusion of Spain within the defense organi-

zation of Western Europe; and I am convinced that by such action we can obtain a much greater return, in military terms, for our expenditures than we are receiving in certain other countries.

On several occasions, in the well of this Chamber, and elsewhere, I have urged that Spain be joined in the alliance for the protection of Europe and for the preservation of freedom-loving peoples of the world. With all the vehemence at my command, I have pointed to the failure of the President and his Secretary of State to negotiate with Spain and our European allies in an effort to incorporate that country into the North Atlantic Pact. If such a conference could not be arranged, or if actual negotiations should be had but fail, then I urge the alternative of a separate armament agreement between the United States and Spain similar to that which we now enjoy with Portugal. Indeed, the agreement with Portugal is recognized as being quite useless unless Spain is included as a partner.

Today, I want to present to this body the impelling reasons why Spain should be made a full partner in the defense of Western Europe. I want also to touch upon the resources of that country and point out to you its strategic military potentials.

Oh, I know that ideological thinking has caused us to shun a nation with whose form of government and with whose internal policies we cannot and do not agree. I know too that, pursuant to action taken by the United Nations Organization, we and other nations cut off diplomatic relations with Spain. But I am happy in the thought that the first step in restoring those relations has been taken in the appointment of Stanton Griffis as American Ambassador to Madrid. Ladies and gentlemen, I say to you that, in this crisis, when the shadow of the great black bear is looming ever larger and more forebodingly over the continent of Europe, we need to give primary consideration to military security.

What kind of business is this? We do not hesitate to make common cause with Tito. Tito—who denounced capitalistic governments and, in particular, the United States of America. Well, I am willing to make medicine with Tito. If we are ever to get into a brawl on the Continent, paraphrasing General Eisenhower, I want to be certain that Tito is swinging chairs on our side. But if we join as partners with Tito, why not with Franco? While we were doling out billions all over the world, Spain asked for nothing and received nothing. Spain has never been on our relief rolls.

Spain has substantial potentialities and her people possess the spirit and will to resist the further spread of communism. She successfully resisted communism in a bloody and grueling civil war which cost hundreds of thousands of lives and left her almost prostrate. Yes, if ever we should again become involved in Europe, I want both Yugoslavia and Spain swinging chairs on our side.

Last fall, I visited the Iberian Peninsula. I saw at first hand many things that enlisted my interest and caused

me to wonder what kind of a diplomacy is it that disdains to avail America of an invaluable contribution that could be made to our great plans for defense. I wonder what passed through General Eisenhower's mind when recently, he flew from Portugal to Italy over the high plateaus and snow-capped mountains of Spain? Can it be doubted that he gave much thought to the important role Spain could play in the defense plans for Western Europe?

The star of Spain has risen and descended. Following the discovery of America by Columbus, an Italian sailing under the flag of Ferdinand and Isabella, the fortunes of Spain expanded until the sun never set on her soil: South, Central, and North America; settlements in the Mediterranean; colonies in the Far East. Then, with the destruction of the great armada in 1588, not by Britain's might, but by a great storm of the sea, off the coast of Ireland, the decline of Spain as a world power commenced. During the period from 1810 to 1825, she lost all of her colonies on the American Continent. The Spanish-American War in 1898 ended with the loss of her remaining significant colonies: Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines.

SPAIN AND HER COLONIAL AND INSULAR POSSESSIONS

But though Spain disappeared from the scene as a world power, she occupies, nonetheless, a most strategic position in any defense plans for Europe. The mainland, consisting of the Iberian Peninsula, affords a natural bastion, which can serve either in the defense of the southwest of Europe, or as an assembly area from where a counterattack could be launched. The Pyrenees Mountains to the north form a natural barrier through which ground troops could be moved only with great difficulty. Spain holds a protectorate over Spanish Morocco which lies just across the Straits of Gibraltar in North Africa and is so situated as to prove of highly significant strategic value in the control of that corridor that leads from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean. Think what the control of the Straits of Gibraltar meant to us in World War II. Unmolested, our fleets passed through this corridor, including the mighty task forces which captured Oran and Algiers.

Further lending itself to control of the Mediterranean, Spain possesses the Balearic Islands. Off the northwest coast of Africa, she has the important Canary Islands, on which is located Spain's only important oil refinery. Scattered along the west coast of the African Continent, on and off the mainland, are the following colonies: The Territory of Ifni, the Spanish Western Sahara, the Spanish Guinea, and the Islands of Fernando Po, Annobon, Corisco and the Elobeyes.

Thus, it will be seen that not only is Spain strategically situated for any plan to protect Western Europe and the Mediterranean, but also could make most valuable contributions in the plan to defend all of Africa, a continent which is presently furnishing us with indispensable strategic materials essential in war production and in the development of

atomic energy in all its forms. Governor Dewey, of New York, recently, before the joint Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, laid primary emphasis on the importance of these strategic materials. He stated that were these important supplies to be cut off the wheels of American industry generally would slowly grind to a halt. His information, he stated, had been gathered from highly informed and reliable sources. In the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1951, appears an editorial based upon a bulletin issued by the National Geographic Society telling of the discovery of an enormous mountain of tin in the Belgian Congo. The editorial goes on to say that Africa has long furnished to the world cobalt, industrial diamonds, coal, zinc, cadmium, lead, silver, platinum, palladium, and gold. Africa also has fabulous copper resources and half of the world's known supply of uranium ore. The United States is dependent on Africa and the Far East for furnishing of most of these metals.

Moreover, Africa has long been regarded by military strategists as indispensable in any world-wide plan of defense for Western Europe and the Americas. It must be plain to everyone that Spanish possessions would play a most invaluable role in such plans.

HARBOR, HIGHWAY, AND RAIL FACILITIES

Large, adequate seaports are located at Barcelona, Bilbao, Valencia, and Seville; 11 lesser ports are also located on the mainland. All the colonies possess fair port and harbor facilities.

Spain has some 10,500 miles of railroads, much of it constructed at great cost through difficult terrain. About half of the mileage is wide-gage, and the remainder of varying gages. Three lines pass through the Pyrenees into France. Spain needs help in standardizing her rails, needs new equipment, and her system needs reorganization. American ingenuity and perhaps American financial help by way of loan could be of assistance in solving these problems.

Because of the inadequacy of her railroads, highways are of greatest importance in Spain. Some 50,000 miles of roads radiate from Madrid to all seaports. These roads are only in fair condition and are not kept in the best state of repair, but they would play an important part in any logistic military plans.

AIRFIELDS AND AIR POWER

In commercial aviation, Spain is already playing an important role as a traffic base between the East and the West. The airports of Madrid and Barcelona have become important communication centers for Europe and North and South American lines, which connect all of Europe with Africa, Asia, and the Americas. Internal aviation service has been greatly improved and airfields generally are being modernized.

A new military airstrip accommodating large aircraft was opened in Madrid in February of this year. It can accommodate aircraft of 150 tons. This installation has military value. Other airfields capable of handling heavy aircraft are located at Barajas, at Barcelona, Seville, Bilbao, and Valencia. All

of these have important military potentials.

Near Antiago de la Ribera on the Mediterranean, there is a huge air training reservation with very substantial accommodations and facilities for air cadets.

Important airports are located at Melilla in North Africa, the Canary Islands, Guando in Los Palinas and Los Rodeos in Tauerife, all of which are of great strategic importance as links with the continent of Africa.

COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

Spain is supplied with a nation-wide telephone and telegraph system. Government-owned radio reaches to all sections of the country. International cable and radio-telegraph facilities, largely controlled by American and British capital, connect Spain with New York, Buenos Aires and the British Isles. These become important considerations in any military planning.

INDUSTRIAL CAPACITY AND POTENTIALS

It is well known, of course, that much poverty prevails in Spain, but it is nevertheless true that she has important resources and industrial facilities, and that she possesses substantial potential capacities which, with assistance, could be developed. There are some 2,570 cotton textile mills in Spain, which process some 100,000 metric tons of cotton annually. She produces an average annual cotton crop of close to 20,000 bales of 220 kilograms each.

Spain produces and processes a substantial amount of wool, rayon, and jute. She produces annually some 135,000 metric tons of paper and processes some 8,000 tons of rubber.

The iron and steel industry, while relatively small, is heavily concentrated and does fairly well in supplying domestic needs.

The engineering industry is highly developed. Spain constructs locomotives, rolling stock, and other railway material. The industry produces steam engines, internal combustion engines, cranes, bicycles, sewing machines, textile machinery, some machine tools, small arms, artillery and other heavy armament, steam and motor rollers, agricultural machinery, refrigeration plants, and typewriters. Shipbuilding facilities exist at Bilbao, Cadiz, Valencia, and at the national naval yard. Some electric appliances are produced but insufficient to meet domestic requirements.

The chemical industry of Spain is important. The principal chemicals produced are superphosphates, hydrochloric, sulfuric and nitric acids; caustic soda; sulfur; calcium carbide; sulfate of ammonia; copper sulfate; and common salt. Explosives, dyestuffs, and pharmaceutical products are also manufactured in substantial quantity.

Other industries of Spain include the manufacture of tiles, earthenware, glassware, bricks, furniture, and leather, as well as flour milling and sugar refining.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Of course, agriculture is the basis of Spain's economy. Before the revolution,

the country was self-supporting in most essential foodstuffs. And agricultural products accounted for approximately two-thirds of Spain's exports. But Spain's greatest wealth, her soil, has been depleted by failure to maintain a fertilizer program. In addition, she has been hard hit by droughts since 1945—droughts that have served to deplete her crops and her hydroelectric power sources.

SIGNIFICANCE OF SPANISH ECONOMY

I trust my colleagues will not regard this hurried review of the economic resources of Spain as a pedantic lecture on things that most people should know. But I am attempting to bring into focus all the contributions Spain could make were she to be incorporated into the defense of Western Europe. Spain needs to be strengthened economically. If we are to continue the Marshall plan, the military assistance plan, and, mayhap, a point 4 plan, then I insist that assistance should be given to Spain's economy, in order that she may become a stronger partner, either as a member of the North Atlantic Pact or in separate alliance with Portugal and the United States of America.

MILITARY POTENTIALS

I have dwelt on the strategic advantages to be gained by an alliance with Spain. I now wish to present to the House the actual and potential military contributions Spain could make in the way of war matériel and manpower.

The Spanish Army is the largest non-Communist fighting force in Europe today. It has 422,000 men in 22 divisions. It is estimated that, if necessary, they could put 2,000,000 men in the field. Spain's infantry demonstrated beyond peradventure, in the civil war, its capacity for tough fighting. Its army is composed chiefly of peasants who can operate in the field without too much in the way of refined equipment, food, or transportation. Even so, the soldiers of the Spanish Army are well-fed and clothed. The Spanish arsenals produce enough machine guns, Mauser rifles, and revolvers, but the army is deficient in heavy artillery, tanks, and support.

In the matter of officer strength, Spain maintains a most commendable training program. Most university students are required to do 2 months' summer training over a period of years in order to become reserve commissioned officers and in order to hold those commissions, or to advance to higher grades.

Spain's Navy is old and of little consequence. Likewise her air force, though she presently has some 1,500 trained pilots with a small number of antiquated aircraft.

Having said this, however, I wish to emphasize to the Members of the House that Spain has an estimated potential military manpower of 2,000,000 men, and if well trained, equipped, and supplied, they could furnish one of the greatest contributions to the defense of Western Europe of any of the nations joined in the effort to stem the spread of the communistic menace. And, remember, Spain has several hundred

thousand seasoned combat veterans—veterans of the terrible civil war. This fact alone would insure that her contributions would be invaluable.

LET'S MAKE SPAIN OUR ALLY

And so I say, let us make Spain our ally—an ally in the North Atlantic Pact or an ally under separate agreement with the United States and Portugal. An ally to help maintain the peace, but an ally, too, in the event of war which we seek to avoid. Who, more than Spain, has experienced the meaning and significance of communism? Spain is the one nation of Western Europe today which has demonstrated the will to fight and repulse the incursion of communism.

The Spaniards know that, standing alone, and in the present state of their armament, they could not resist for long even with the great natural barrier of the Pyrenees, and no matter how desperate and heroic their resistance might be.

I know that Spain is asking, "How can we save ourselves?" I believe General Eisenhower has come to symbolize the iron will to resist, and that the United States has come to symbolize the arsenal that can insure peace or that can turn that resistance to victory should the situation demand.

We need alliance with Spain because of her strategic geographical advantages. We need alliance with Spain because of her resources and facilities. We need alliance with Spain because of her trained and reserve military manpower. We need alliance with Spain to assist in keeping available to us the strategic materials found in Africa, and to insure air lanes across that continent. We need alliance with Spain, above all things, because of her indomitable will to resist the aggression that threatens Europe and the rest of the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S SPEECH ON INFLATION

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from my constituents back home asking for my views on President Truman's message asking for economic controls, given on Thursday, June 14. The following are the comments that I have made to my people.

I listened very intently Thursday night, June 14, to President Truman's speech on inflation.

I noted with regret that, instead of trying to unify the country, he proceeded to castigate certain large segments of our peoples. He used the National Association of Manufacturers as his whipping boy again. Well, I do not think the National Association of Manufacturers is always on the right track, but I certainly have respect for their judgment just as I have respect for the judgment

of our great labor leaders, farm leaders and leaders in other segments of our society.

Furthermore, even when their views conflict, which is quite often, I do not believe that one would find more or less sincerity or patriotism in any particular one of these groups. I would expect the President to reach this same conclusion. I further noted that President Truman used deception in his speech to the American public. He castigated the people who wanted to take off controls back in 1946. Well, certain people's memory may be short, but I think most recall that it was President Truman himself who took off controls 2 months before the Eightieth Congress met for the first time in January 1947. He may castigate the NAM or other groups for giving him bad advice, but to be honest, he should have stated it that way. He and he alone assumed the responsibility for taking off controls. Personally, I think controls should have come off and I believe this could have been accomplished successfully if the President had properly performed his job.

But this is water over the dam. It does not help solve our present problems. And that is what the President should have directed our attention to, alone.

First of all, in talking about the need for controls and the continuance of the present emergency, the President said not one word about the basic force lying behind inflation—the \$260,000,000,000 Federal debt. A \$260,000,000,000 Federal debt means that we have extended credit, issued paper money, to the extent of \$260,000,000,000 beyond the normal credit existing in our private-enterprise system. This is bound to bring inflation. To stop it we must cut to the bone Federal expenditures and start paying off the Federal debt, at least not increase it. We cannot buy everything we might want to buy tomorrow. You and I have to plan when we can afford to buy an icebox or an automobile. We may have to put it off for a year or two. Well, if we are to beat inflation, so must our Federal Government put off buying what it cannot afford this year.

We must, of course, buy what is necessary for national defense, but even here, intelligence prescribes that we schedule our buying. It is not the people who are at fault for inflation. It is the Federal Government in its spending program, and President Truman said not one word about cutting Federal expenditures or balancing the budget in his speech.

All he said was he wanted more controls. Well, controls simply put the lid on the steaming saucepan. If you do not lower or douse the fire under the saucepan, no lid will keep the steam in. In fact, you may get an explosion.

I am against controls unless we hit at the fire causing inflation at the same time. I am in favor of extending the power of the President to impose controls across the board—which powers he has now had for almost 8 months—so that he can immediately impose controls when he douses the fire. But I do so with great fear, because if the fire is allowed to burn, imposition of controls will

be a very dangerous and very ineffective procedure. The power to control is a terrible power. It should be applied only with the greatest of caution and wisdom. A wise man, if he did request this power, would request it with humility and prayer, not with arrogance, blame and bluster.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday, June 26, 1951, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FUR LABELING

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 256 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2321) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentlemen from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] and I now yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 256 makes in order H. R. 2321, a bill to protect the consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs. The bill is designed to protect the consumers and others from widespread abuses arising out of the frequent practice of the fur trade of using, in advertisements and otherwise, in a false and misleading manner, foreign animal names and glamorous, fictitious designations for furs and fur products. It requires further that when furs or fur products are advertised in such commerce or after having been shipped and received in such commerce, these vital facts be truthfully stated in the advertising.

The bill makes it unlawful and declares it an unfair and deceptive act and practice within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act to market in interstate or foreign commerce either furs or fur products which are not respectively invoiced and labeled to show the true name of the animal, and other factual information affecting the value of both furs and fur products.

The fur trade is a large and growing segment of American business. Latest

available figures indicate that the American public is buying the output of this industry at the rate of \$500,000,000 a year. While furs are natural products, they are peculiarly susceptible to dyeing and other manipulations and processing which tend to change their appearance. Such manipulations are commonly undertaken for the purpose of simulating more expensive furs in appearance. This practice makes it easily possible for the purchasing public to be misled and deceived. This legislation will go far toward protecting consumers.

This bill was previously passed in the Eighty-first Congress, I believe, by a substantial majority. The rule provides for 1-hour general debate, to be equally divided between the majority and minority.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to it, and I ask for its adoption.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2321 is, as the gentleman from New York has stated, quite similar, if not almost identical, to bills which have previously been reported to the House no less than three times. On one occasion the bill was actually passed by the House.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Have not significant amendments been offered to this bill making it quite unlike the bill adopted in the last Congress with reference to the simulation clause?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I will say to the gentleman, I have not studied the bill meticulously along that line, but I am informed that the bill is substantially the same as previously reported. In general debate I am sure the gentleman's question can be completely answered.

I recall having been present during hearings on this bill in the previous Congress in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and from that experience I am well aware of the need for legislation of this kind. I recall in those hearings we had a witness talking to us, giving testimony, and he mentioned a trade name "jungle mink raccoon." Upon questioning by the committee it was revealed that there was nothing with reference to the jungle in connection with that particular fur. So that part of the name was considered to be misleading. Then it was developed that the fur certainly did not come from mink or any member of the mink family, so that part of the trade name of that particular fur was ruled out. Then, of course, that left the word "racoon," so one member of the committee said to the witness:

"Well, I assume then the fur is raccoon," whereupon the witness said:

"No, Congressman, as a matter of fact, the fur is rabbit."

That sort of thing has gone on in the fur trade for some time and I assume is still going on. Consumers are being misled when they purchase furs in many, many instances, so it seemed to the committee that it was high time to pass leg-

islation to protect the consumer against misbranding and mislabeling.

As I recall it, the legitimate fur trade, the dealers in furs who are part of that industry and conduct their businesses entirely legitimately, have no objection to this legislation.

Further, may I say that the committee was unanimous in reporting this bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States should at the present session do everything possible to make certain that we pass an amended and improved Railroad Retirement Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege and honor of representing a very large number of men and women who live in the Ninth Congressional District of Kentucky who are employees of railroad companies.

It is my duty as the representative and spokesman for this fine group of American citizens to represent their best interests in urging this present Congress to speed up its action on an amended railroad retirement bill so as to insure its enactment at the present session of Congress.

In order that the entire membership of the Congress may be well acquainted with the underlying facts which support a new act I wish to bring before you and urge your serious consideration of the following:

The first year I represented my people I made a very thorough study of the existing laws pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act. For a period of 2 months, as time would permit, I tried to learn everything I could about the history and the practical application of the act which became a law in 1937, and also the amendments since that date.

It will first be remembered that this huge fund of money was created by the men themselves by taking a portion of their wages each month and setting it aside to build up a fund to guarantee to them and their dependents security when supplemented by an equal amount from their employers created the fund to which these men look for their annuities to assist their dependents in case they pass away, and to guarantee to them pensions and annuities when they retire. It should be well known by every Member of Congress that the payment of pensions and annuities does not come from the taxpayers of America, but that the fund in reality belongs to these men and their dependents under the law of the Federal Government.

To begin with, I learned that over the years this fund had grown and accumulated as is set forth in this table.

Up to June 1938 collections from the men and railroad companies amounted

to \$150,477,279, and from this fund there had been paid out in benefits \$87,169,151.

The following figures in this table give the amount of receipts and the payments made out of the fund for each year:

	Receipts	Payments
1938-39.....	\$109,256,540	\$107,131,438
1939-40.....	120,966,719	114,025,141
1940-41.....	136,942,076	121,799,903
1941-42.....	170,011,691	126,656,781
1942-43.....	208,794,892	130,863,977
1943-44.....	267,064,593	135,215,326
1944-45.....	285,037,862	142,527,642
1945-46.....	282,610,497	153,815,252
1946-47.....	380,057,125	173,101,153
1947-48.....	557,060,782	224,871,297
July 1948 to May 1949.....	434,523,001	268,558,872

At the end of May 1949, the balance in the retirement account over all expenditures was \$1,692,338,000.

After making this study and knowing that the cost of living had increased tremendously, I did, in the first year that I represented these people in Congress, and on June 6, 1949, introduced an amended Railroad Retirement Act, which was numbered H. R. 5005.

Throughout the balance of 1949-50 during the Eighty-first session of Congress I made many trips to visit and had many conferences with the chairman and other members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, that has the right, power, and jurisdiction to hold hearings upon this subject, but during the Eighty-first Congress, of which I was a Member, we were not able to have hearings and bring out a bill.

When the people of my district saw fit to reelect me to the present Congress, the Eighty-second Congress, I made a further study of the money that has been accumulating in this railroad-retirement fund and I found that these following additional funds had accumulated since I introduced H. R. 5005 in June 1949. In the year 1948-49 there was collected \$563,832,724. There was paid out during this period, \$283,052,033.

During the 1949-50 fiscal year, there was collected \$550,173,200 and there was only paid out during this period \$301,452,273.

And in the last half of 1950, from July to December, there was collected \$282,895,350, and there was paid out \$156,777,765.

It will be noted that in recent years this fund has been increasing at the rate of more than \$200,000,000 per year over all expenditures.

The balance remaining in the fund on December 31, 1950, was \$2,369,008,240.

Being fully aware of the tremendous needs for additional benefits through this fund to the railroad men and women who had already retired and those would retire in the future, I made another study to get up some facts on the increased cost of living since there was any material increase in payment of benefits from this fund. Beginning back in the year 1937, when the Railroad Retirement Act first became a law, I place before my colleagues an index showing the increase in the price of the essential things that every family has to have. I

am indebted to our colleague, Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, for this table and index:

Price index

	1937	1948	Nov. 15, 1950
Food.....	105.3	210.2	209.5
Apparel.....	102.8	108.0	105.0
Rent.....	100.9	117.4	125.4
Fuel, electricity, and refrigeration.....	100.2	133.9	143.7
Household furnishings.....	104.3	196.8	202.3
Miscellaneous.....	101.0	149.9	160.5
All items.....	102.7	171.2	175.6

Armed with these facts and early in the present session of Congress, I introduced another bill seeking to reenact and to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, which is H. R. 2533, and was introduced by me on February 8, 1951.

It is my opinion that the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives is made up of sincere and learned members from both the Republican and Democratic side of the House. I do believe that they are deeply concerned and interested in bringing before this Congress the very best bill that the facts and circumstance and the solvency of the fund will permit.

After I introduced the above referred to bill I talked to a great many other Congressmen, and I visited and talked with the Members who served upon this great Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I found that there was keen interest in beneficial amendments, insofar as the strength of the fund would allow, and finally it was the decision of this committee to open hearings and to hear evidence on this vital subject and to my keen satisfaction this committee began to hold hearings on bills to amend and improve the Railroad Retirement Act on Monday morning, May 14, 1951.

The chairman and other members of this committee knew that I had a very large number of railroad men in my district, and they knew that I was vitally concerned with a bill to improve this law.

When this committee met in their very large and beautiful committee room, that is much larger than most circuit courtrooms in my home district, I went down before this committee, and I was shown the courtesy by the chairman and other members of the committee on both sides of being allowed to speak to this committee on the vital necessity of bringing out a new and improved Railroad Retirement Act. This committee room was packed with representatives of the great brotherhood organizations of America and quite a few Congressmen, who represented, as I do, large numbers of railroad men and women, and it was with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction when I was called upon to give my ideas to this committee there, early in the hearings, and, in fact, being the second man that was allowed to speak.

I do know that this committee has for more than a month now been hearing evidence and getting every pertinent fact possible looking toward bringing out the best bill that the financial strength of the present fund will permit.

The bill which I have introduced provides for a straight 25-percent increase in pensions and annuities to men and women who have retired and to those that will retire in the future, and it provides for increased protection and payments to the widows and dependent children of deceased railroad employees.

This committee has had the benefit of many scholars, students, accountants, and statisticians that have given much time to a study of the financial strength of this fund and the future payments that may be made from it. They are very seriously considering two plans, as I understand it. It seems to be the thought of many good men that are interested in this question that we may not be able to increase the payments as much as my bill provides, namely 25 percent, and the committee has made an exhaustive study of this question, and it appears that they are very seriously considering two plans—and maybe more—one of these plans would increase the payment to a retired annuitant by approximately 14 percent, and this plan would give in addition thereto considerable increases to the widow of a deceased employee and would also increase the benefits to dependent children.

The other plan being considered would give a 16-percent increase in the annuity and pension to retired employees only, but as I understand it, it does not provide for any increase for widows, except in a few cases.

I have received hundreds of letters from thoughtful, interested, sensible railroad men in my own district. I believe most of these letters mention the fact that they would like to have more protection for their widows in case they should die. My bill provides for this, and it provides for many improvements.

Considering the fact that the present Congress must pass upon many bills of Nation-wide importance and many that affect the entire world, in our efforts to build up the defenses of this country and to secure it against the onward rush of the Communist dictators, it is perfectly apparent to me that if we secure the passage of a good, beneficial railroad retirement act at the present session of Congress, we shall all be required to work together, get this bill out of committee as soon as possible, and seek an opportunity to bring it before the membership of the Congress for public debate.

I think I know, from talking with members of this fine committee, that they are bending every effort to do just that thing, and it is my confident hope that they will report a bill out in the very near future, and I call upon my colleagues in the Congress to acquaint themselves with the great need for improving the annuities, pensions, and payments under the Railroad Retirement Act, so that when this bill is brought before us for debate that we can discuss it fully, debate the various provisions and amendments and arrive at a decision that will give to the people whom we represent the very best increases possible, yet at the same time making sure that we leave this fund solvent and strong.

I urge all Members of Congress to make a sincere study of this question and to be ready to participate in the debates on this bill and to vote wisely and conscientiously upon a greatly improved and expanded railroad retirement bill.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2321) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2321, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated, the bill we bring before the committee today is not strange, new, and different legislation. We have had this bill before us at least twice before. This kind of legislation is not without precedent, insofar as the action of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is concerned. Several years ago we passed the wool labeling bill, which did in regard to wool and woolen products substantially what this bill does in regard to fur.

We had much testimony in two preceding Congresses before we brought the bill to the floor. In order to be fair and in order to give everybody an opportunity to be heard who wished to be heard, we again held hearings on this legislation this session. As has been indicated, after hearing the considerable testimony for a third time, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously reported this bill. Its purpose simply is to give to the consuming public that purchase furs the opportunity to know what they are buying.

Our colleague on the committee, one who has worked on this subject from the beginning and who is the author of the bill, is a real authority, in my opinion, on the problems that are involved. It is not my purpose to take any more time, because I know that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] will give a very ample explanation of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, as those who have previously spoken on the bill and who have given you a general outline

of it have said, it is true that this legislation is patterned after the so-called truth-in-wool bill which was passed in 1939 by this Congress.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The fur-labeling bill was introduced by me in the Eightieth Congress—H. R. 3734. Hearings were held on this bill by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on April 6 and 7, 1948. The bill was reported favorably with amendments by the committee, but in the rush of the close of the session, it was not possible to obtain passage.

During the Eighty-first Congress, new fur labeling bills were introduced by Mr. Sadowski and myself. Hearings were held on these two bills by the committee on May 11, 12, and 13, 1949. As a result of these hearings, a clean bill—H. R. 5187—was introduced by me. It was reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—House Report No. 919, Eighty-first Congress. H. R. 5187 passed the House on July 14, 1949. Hearings were held in the Senate on this, and it was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. No legislative action was taken thereafter.

The present legislation was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, and a rule was granted last week by the Rules Committee. The above history shows the action of the committees in reporting the legislation, and in the instance of the last session of Congress when the legislation was debated and passed out of committee, shows the action of the House of Representatives was unanimous in favor of this legislation.

I realize that the older members of the committee are fully familiar with the bill which has been twice unanimously reported out of this committee, and as the chairman has indicated, it passed the House and a similar intended bill has already been reported out of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the will of the committee will be worked out upon whatever type of legislation I am urging the passage of.

H. R. 2321 is the identical bill reported out of this committee which was given a rule unanimously by the Rules Committee and passed the House after a full debate in the Eighty-first Congress, without any dissenting votes.

I believe there were two small, clarifying amendments included in that legislation which were adopted upon the floor of the House, one by my colleague Mr. Wilson, of Oklahoma, and one by myself, which amendments appear in the bill.

The bill is primarily designed, Mr. Chairman, to protect consumers from the practice of at least part of the fur trade, of using false or misleading statements in advertisements, of foreign animal names and glamorous, fictitious names for furs and fur products.

Furs are particularly susceptible to dyeing and processing, which tends to change their appearance. The manufacturing industry—and it is a compliment to them—are so successful that

they can dye, color, and change a fur, such as rabbit fur, to resemble a far more expensive fur. This imitation, coupled with misleading and flamboyant statements in advertising, makes it easily possible for the purchasing public to be misled and deceived.

In hearings before the committee, a great deal of testimony was received on these abuses. The record of the House hearings speaks for itself, but I should like to give you a few examples of names under which rabbit coats have been sold to the public.

Beaverett. There is no such animal. But the name is very close to beaver, and the purchaser might well believe he was getting some kind of a beaver's relative, when it is actually rabbit.

Ermiline. There is no such animal in existence, but the name is suggestive of ermine, which is an expensive fur. An ignorant purchaser might think he is buying ermine when he is buying ermiline.

Lapin is the name of another fur coat. That is the French name for rabbit.

Other names are Hudseal, mink coney, and sealine. All of them are rabbit furs.

Muskrat has been described as Hudson seal, diver sable, and water mink.

I could go on for a long time. Any of the Members who are interested in additional examples might have a look at the list of them set forth on page 70 of the hearings in the House. This list gives the designations used, the correct name of the fur, and the name and date of the publications in which the advertiser used such designation.

Filed in the committee there are a number of photostatic copies of original advertisements taken from all over the country with these flamboyant, misleading, and deceptive terms in the advertising.

The Federal Trade Commission has endeavored to correct some of these practices. However, these practices are so widespread that enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission, through its normal processes, is exceedingly difficult. Furthermore, such practices are engaged in frequently by retailers, who are beyond the reach of the Commission because they are engaged in intrastate rather than interstate commerce. Therefore, specific legislation on this subject is considered necessary.

The remedy suggested in this bill is the mandatory invoicing of furs and the mandatory labeling of fur products moving in interstate or foreign commerce under the usual name of the animal that produced the fur.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, in that connection there were two changes, I believe, which were made by the House committee. The original bill which was introduced—and there were several—it has been written and rewritten in an attempt to meet some of the legitimate claims of the industry.

I want to say that we had a provision in there which provided that if the fur product was made from a foreign animal the label should show that. The other provision was that if it was changed and given some fictitious name to represent some other animal than it was that it

should show that it was processed to imitate.

The subcommittee and the Eighty-first Congress adopted the language "proceed to simulate." Now, the industry probably felt that "imitate" was a stigma. The committee went along with the subcommittee and agreed with them.

I am not arguing particularly about that, but I do feel that with reference to the provision as to whether it was made of a foreign fur should still be in the law. But it was not in the bill as reported by the subcommittee of either committee.

In addition, the label or advertisement is to set forth other information vital to the consumer, such as, first, whether the garment contains used fur; second, whether the fur is dyed or bleached; and, third, whether the product is composed of waste fur or other inferior parts of the pelt.

There is an excellent precedent for the kind of informative labeling proposed in this bill. As some of the Members may well recall, in 1939 Congress passed the Wool Products Labeling Act. This act, which was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, requires disclosure of the wool contents of a fabric or article. The act is also known as the Truth in Fabric Act.

The Wool and Products Labeling Act, while vigorously opposed at the time by many segments of the trade, is today recognized as an outstanding piece of consumers' protective legislation.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the House of Representatives have indicated that they feel that similar protection is required for the purchasers of furs and fur products.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a single person today who raises his voice and says that the Wool Products Labeling Act should be changed or repealed or modified one iota.

Now, if that is the truth-in-wool act, then this should be known as the truth-in-fur act, because it has identically the same purpose as the Wool Labeling Act.

The fur-products labeling bill, like the Wool Products Labeling Act, would be administered by the Federal Trade Commission. The enforcement provisions of the fur-labeling bill closely follow those of the Wool Products Labeling Act.

The Commission may issue cease-and-desist orders and, wherever necessary, may report to condemnation and injunctive proceedings. A criminal penalty is also provided for willful violations of the provisions of the act.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, that has to be reported to the Attorney General for action.

The bill further directs the Federal Trade Commission to set up a register of names to be known as the "fur-products name guide." This guide would set forth the true English names of fur-bearing animals, or, in the absence of such a name, the name by which such animal can be properly identified in the United States. In order to correctly describe on the label or in the advertisement the name of the animal that produced the fur, the manufacturer would have to use the name set forth

for such animal in the fur-products name guide.

The use of the name of an animal other than the animal that produced the fur is allowed only if the name of such animal is preceded by the words "processed to simulate." This may sound complicated. However, it is quite simple.

A bad practice has grown up in the fur industry of advertising muskrats, for example, as mink-blended muskrat. Of course, they cannot blend two different types of furs. That cannot be done, as I understand it from the gentlemen who are experts on this matter, but what they are doing is to give it, of course, the connotation of adjacently mink blended so as to create the impression that it is mink, at least partly mink. What that conveys to the consumer, I am not quite sure. I am reasonably sure, however, that it is, to say the least, confusing to the consumer.

If the bill is enacted, such muskrat coat would either have to be advertised and labeled purely and simply as a muskrat coat or, if the manufacturer or retailer insists on using the word "mink" in connection with muskrat, he would have to advertise or label the coat as "muskrat processed to simulate mink." In this way, the consumer will be absolutely certain as to what he is getting.

To summarize this all briefly:

The abuses which this bill aims to cure are very widespread. Attempts to eliminate these abuses under the Federal Trade Commission Act itself have failed. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House was unanimous in the belief that legislation is required to protect consumers of furs and fur products, and that in this case the pattern set so successfully by the Wool Products Labeling Act should be followed.

The effect of this bill will be to require honest, fair labeling, and honest advertising, and will afford protection of a very substantial character, not only to the buying public but also to the industry and trades engaged in the fur business.

Certainly I would be the first to state that many of those engaged in this industry are honorable, high-type people. There is also the other type who are out to deceive the public and to mislead them. This legislation is imperative to make it possible to adequately reach the evils in question.

I am reliably informed by some of the expert processors that even many of the buyers and operators of high-class stores themselves are inexpert in judging furs which are sold to them, which means that these honorable dealers are the victims of fraud which they innocently pass on to the general public.

As one instance of that, Mr. Chairman, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show one of the Members of Congress during the debate on this bill told of going and buying what he thought was an ermine coat. When he had it a few days, of course, or a short time, he realized that it was not a fur coat. It was rabbit, and the merchant who sold it to him was just as much deceived as was the gentleman who bought the coat.

The practice of taking some cheap fur and giving it a high-sounding name, implying that it comes from some northern climate, and with flamboyant titles which indicate that the fur is something which it is not, is the rankest kind of fraud.

People generally have the impression that the better furs come from the northern climates. That is not necessarily true. Excellent furs are produced in the southern climates, such as Louisiana, Maryland, and Virginia.

It is also true that many furs are advertised as coming from some foreign land and are sold on the basis that they are long-wearing and a very fine fur, when, as a matter of fact, some of these highly advertised fur coats are not as long-wearing as some of the furs produced in this country.

I am particularly thinking, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, of the muskrat coat. The muskrat coat is probably, as I understand from the fur industry, as fine a product for the money as a person could buy, for both wearing ability and wearing qualities, and colors.

The industry itself has many problems, and this bill has been written and rewritten in order to remove what would be an undue harassment to the industry.

As an illustration, I am reliably informed that one of the representatives of a large fur-manufacturing group in the city of New York had appealed for advice to the Federal Trade Commission, dealing with the action of certain buyers, who after negotiating for the purchase of a number of fur coats made of wombat, which is a sort of ground squirrel, insisted that the coats be invoiced to them as Russian weasel instead of wombat, and would not take the coats unless they were so invoiced by these dealers. Now, Russian weasel would be a false name, as these other animals are a type of ground squirrel and are not of the weasel family and, further, are not as valuable or as long-wearing fur. From this you can see what the decent industry is up against in these negotiations in the give-and-take of the fur trade.

Now, I realize that many of these gentlemen who are here opposing this bill have continuously opposed it from the first hearing on to the last. I presume they will continue to oppose it. Personally, I have tried to meet with the industry whenever they have asked for it. I have tried to work these matters out to have a fair and a good bill.

These gentlemen will claim that there is no consumer demand for this type of legislation. Now, I have quite a file of letters, and I should like to read into the RECORD two letters which I have received, Mr. Chairman, which are illustrative of the need of this type of legislation.

The first one is a letter which I received shortly after this bill passed the House, from New Orleans, La. I inserted it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 15, at page A4601. It reads as follows:

Congressman O'HARA, of Minnesota.
DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a page of the Louisiana Retailers' Bulletin which you will be

interested in reading. It represents the opinion of one man.

Thousands of retailers are in favor of your bill to require more labeling of furs.

Customers, as you probably know, have been getting gypped for years by the crooks in the fur business. In the trade they say: "It is a skin game in more ways than one."

The hundreds of prosecutions in the files of the Federal Trade Commission will show how necessary your bill is.

You know that there are more than 150 trade names for rabbit skin alone, including Baltic Lion. Women absolutely do not know what these trade names mean. They do not know that Chinese wool, for example, is plain old dog.

Not one woman in a thousand knows that a marmink is a ground hog dyed to look like a mink. Northern seal, I know has frequently been sold as genuine seal, although it is clipped rabbit dyed black.

The very best of luck to you, and God bless you for introducing that bill. The public will be grateful.

Mr. Chairman, another type of letter which I received is the following: It is dated August 15, 1948, and is from Cicero, Ill.:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have just finished reading your article in the August issue of the American magazine, and I wish I would have known some of the things I read there 3½ years ago.

When I was 18, I managed to save \$350 to buy my first fur coat. It was in August. When I passed this fur store in the neighborhood, I saw this beautiful gray fur coat in the window. That was my coat. Everyone that passed stopped and looked and admired it. I went in and tried it on, and it looked even more beautiful on, and it was just \$300.

These people did seem quite anxious to sell the coat. At the time I thought they only realized my enthusiasm and wanted me to be happy. They assured me I would never see another fur coat like it, which was true. I never saw another one there except in this store. Well, I got my coat around Christmas, and I was so happy with it until I noticed every time I moved it the fur flew out all round like a cloud of smoke. Soon little bald spots appeared. I called up the store salesman, and he reassured me all new fur coats did that, and they would fix it with the first cleaning.

I guess I forgot to mention my coat is a chinchilla, or Russian lamb, or supposed to be.

Well, then, I was satisfied for a while. This loosening of fur kept on, and then the coat got such an awful odor it was unbearable. People would look at me and actually move away in the theater. My entire closet was unbearable, and other clothing acquired the odor.

When I was disgusted and took the coat back, he told me that all coats smelled like that, and would not give me any satisfaction. Finally, after enough complaint, he said he would have a new coat made for me, but the same kind, which he did.

This lasted just 3 weeks when the same thing happened, only in this coat the fur turned a sick-green color. He would no longer have anything more to do with me and told me I spilled something on the coat to make it green. Here I am stuck with this coat. When I went to have it put in storage, no one would accept it or clean it because of the condition, odor, and color. I don't know when I will ever be able to afford another fur coat; but believe me, when I do, I will investigate the people I buy from first.

Mr. O'HARA, if there is anything you could do to save people from having this happen, I think it would be the most wonderful thing in the world.

Mr. Chairman, with most people who go to buy a fur coat, whether it is the chairman of this committee or myself, or some poor girl who has probably cheated herself out of the necessary food to buy the garment which she wants—and, of course, a fur coat is as much desired, I presume, by a girl or a young woman or a woman as to us, as a young man, an automobile was—they are both major investments.

The public knows nothing about these furs. I would not any more pretend to know what a fur coat was made of, without some expert to advise me—I would have to depend on them; and the average person is the same way; they know nothing about furs.

As a result—and I say this with all deference to the decent, honest people who are in the fur industry, who tell you exactly what you are getting, approximately how long it will wear, and how to take care of it, as compared with the other element who are in a racket—they are trying to cheat and take the public, and have done a beautiful job of it for a number of years. And I think, Mr. Chairman, it is time that the Congress legislate on this, so that it is a protection not only to the public but to the decent people in the industry.

And I should think that some of them would come in and testify—and I am sorry to say that they have not. I have some letters which I might read, from the industry, one or two. They are limited and they say "We need this." I am informed that the decent people in the industry do not want to come up here and testify against some of their brothers in the same industry.

This bill likewise is for consumer protection, and grows out of the fact that because of the rather flamboyant advertising and the treatment by at least part of the industry a great deal is done in the way of fraud and deception on the buying public, the greater part of whom are completely innocent and have no experience in the buying of furs.

It is customary in the use of these terms to describe the fur after it has been processed into something that is of more expensive nature than the animal which is actually used in the coat or fur product that is sold or so as to give the impression either that it comes from the north country, which is supposed to add to the quality of the fur, or that the trade name that is used indicates that it is a product which comes from the north country. As a matter of fact, those who know something about furs know that oftentimes excellent furs of various kinds, such as the Louisiana muskrat, and furs from other animals which are domesticated and raised in some of the southern States, are equally as good furs, and sometimes even better than those from some of the same animals which are reared in the North.

I am not mentioning Louisiana to disturb my friends from that State because I know of their great concern in this matter. But I do want to say this bill deals with a subject on which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had full hearings. This year we had four rather full days of hearings.

In the bill which was reported out in the Eighty-first Congress which included the terminology which my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, is concerned about, the subcommittee included language in an attempt to satisfy the fur manufacturers and processors and those in the retail trade who are opposed to this legislation.

They used the words "processed to simulate." They did that, as some of my colleagues know who served on the subcommittee, in an effort to satisfy the industry. However, there is nothing that will satisfy the industry or at least that part of it that is opposing this legislation. They simply do not want any legislation at all. They frankly admit there is fraud and deception in the selling and advertising of fur products, but they say they hope it will be cleaned up. It has been a long time since they have been hoping that, and now it is the unanimous feeling of the committee that has had extensive and exhaustive hearings on this bill on three occasions that there is nothing left to be done but to legislate in order to protect the public.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman has pointed out the amendment that I referred to a while ago. In the bill which was voted on favorably in the House last year, there was a clause to the effect that a fur could be labeled mink or simulated fox or processed simulated fox, and so on. That simulation or imitation clause which was in the bill last year is quite common, is it not, in the general Pure Food and Drug Act, where for instance such words are used as "extracts" and "flavorings" and "imitation flavoring" and "imitation extracts" and stones imitating diamonds, and so on.

This bill is much more restrictive than any other law on the books with regard to false advertising and is very much more restrictive than the bill acted on last year; is that not so?

Mr. O'HARA. It does eliminate in the invoicing, advertising, and sale the words "processed to simulate." When the bill was before the subcommittee for a hearing during the Eighty-first Congress there was some suggestion about using the word "imitated" or "processed to imitate." The industry has strongly objected to that term so the subcommittee then in an attempt to satisfy those in the industry who objected to it, accepted the language which was suggested by its proponents in the industry and inserted the clause "processed to simulate."

Well, I just do not know how many people would know what "simulate" means. I think the word "imitation" is very plain. But the Federal Trade Commission feels very strongly on that. You can see what would happen if we left this clause in.

The person selling the fur would have to have the word "rabbit" on it, if it was rabbit; and also he would have to put on the label the words "processed to simulate" mink, or muskrat, or whatever it might be. Of course he might have the word "rabbit" in very, very small letters and then this other clause

"processed to simulate" in small letters, and then have the word "mink" or "muskrat" or "raccoon" or whatever it might be in large letters. That would just be opening the door to further deceit and fraud on the public. If it is obvious from the nature of the article that it can be simulated or processed to resemble anything, he still has to call it rabbit, and the lady or gentleman who is buying that particular fur product is going to know that he or she is buying a certain product.

Amazingly, as my friend, the gentleman from Texas, knows, the greatest importation into this country of skins and furs is of rabbit skins, which is a cheap fur subject to processing and it is processed to resemble many of the finer furs, but of course it will not wear nearly as long or last as long as many of the other furs that it is processed to imitate.

I believe the gentleman from Louisiana had some question to ask. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIS. In this matter of uniformity of language, what about the general law permitting the use of imitation flavoring extracts and other things under the Pure Food and Drug law? For instance, you might have a gelatin imitation of fig preserves imitated to taste like figs, or you might have an imitation strawberry jam that contains a certain part of strawberries, and so on. There is a breaking point and a fair permission to trade fairly by the use of the word "imitation." Let me say, however, that this statute is much broader than what we have on the books under the Pure Food and Drug laws, and those laws have worked out well.

Mr. O'HARA. Under the Pure Food and Drug Act the requirement is that the thing which is being sold, if it is to imitate, has to carry in sufficiently large type the statement that it is an imitation of sugar or whatever product it is, and that is permissible. But they are very strict about it in the way it is sold. I think there is an entirely different situation, let me say to the gentleman from Louisiana, in the matter of furs; I think it is quite obvious when a fur has been treated to imitate something else than it appears so on the surface.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I must yield first to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE], who has been on his feet for some time. I will then yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mr. LARCADE. I wish to ask the gentleman two questions. It may not be generally known that the State of Louisiana is the largest fur-producing State in the Union. I happen to represent the district that produces more furs than any other district in the State of Louisiana, principally muskrat. I know the gentleman from Minnesota knows this, but I should like to ask two questions: First, I want the RECORD to show that this bill is not aimed at the trappers or producers of fur.

Mr. O'HARA. Not at all. It should be most helpful to them.

Mr. LARCADE. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA. That is correct.

Mr. LARCADE. Second, the domestic industry will be protected under the provisions of this bill against the importation of furs from foreign countries, say from China or Russia.

Mr. O'HARA. No, this bill will not prevent the importation of furs from abroad, but when they are shipped in they must be properly labeled, and if dog is shipped in it must not be labeled Baltic lion, or some other flamboyant attractive name.

Mr. LARCADE. That is what I mean; domestic producers will be protected by the bill to that extent.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is correct; it will protect the fur industry as I hope it will the trappers and fur farmers of the United States.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on his bill and its purpose, but I would like to ask a question. Page 14 (b) (1) reads:

Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any person is violating or is about to violate sections 3, 6, or 10 (b) of this act.

What is the gentleman's interpretation of the words "about to violate"? How could that fact be arrived at and what would be the penalty?

Mr. O'HARA. I suppose that is where it is obvious to those who are charged with the enforcement of this act that somebody is getting into a situation where they are violating the law. It permits a cease-and-desist order to be obtained by the Federal Trade Commission to prevent the deception upon the public. It was a suggestion, let me say to the gentleman from Illinois, of the Federal Trade Commission itself from their experience in dealing with this subject in the enforcement of the truth-in-wool-labeling bill.

Mrs. CHURCH. Does this bill affect the situation arising from fraudulent advertising?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The Pure Food and Drug Law has been mentioned, and how it works; is it not one of the fundamentals of the Pure Food and Drug Law that insofar as possible the food, for example, must bear the name that will be best understood by the purchasing public?

Mr. O'HARA. That is correct.

Mr. BECKWORTH. So that there can be no deception. I remember very distinctly in regard to the question of trying to rename dry skim milk. One of the important fundamentals that was often made known to our committee was that it must be so labeled that the average person purchasing it would know what he was buying. That is exactly what this legislation has as its purpose, that the purchasing individual may know exactly what he is getting hold of in the way of a skin.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to test my colleague's knowledge of just how far-reaching this bill is, having had some knowledge of the fur business. I want to ask the gentleman if he ever saw a fur coat with a trade label on or advertised for sale as rabbit?

Mr. O'HARA. Let me say to the gentleman in all candor I am not an expert furrier in any sense. I have only had one experience in buying a fur coat, and that was for my wife. I definitely was not interested in buying rabbit, so I cannot say that I ever had any experience in that regard.

Mr. WIER. For the gentleman's information, out of the experience I have had, on the fur market, at least up until the time I came to this body, I know of 14 different trade names out of the fur industry in which the same rabbit would have applied and the price for that finished coat out of the same rabbit varied from \$50 to \$350 by the process of the finishing and the ability to transform that fur into a limitation of about seven animals from the northland.

Now, then, with regard to muskrat that has been mentioned here, in the field of finishing muskrat there is on the fur market today at least eight trade names on finished fur coats and they all come from the same muskrat. The price will vary proportionately, due, of course, to the finishing and the label of the product. I say very sincerely in the interest of people who like to be flashy and dressy and have a well-paid-for coat, that in the fur industry in the main you will find the greatest number of coats sold come from muskrat or rabbit.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman and I admit his qualifications as an expert.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My experience in the fur-coat business is limited, as is that of the gentleman from Minnesota. That rabbit the gentleman from Minnesota has been talking about must have been a big one.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. At several places in the bill the term "advertising" is used, for example on page 5, "Any person introducing, selling, advertising, or offering for sale." Standing by itself I am wondering if it may not be interpreted as applying to the advertising medium? I feel certain that the intent of the committee was not to charge a newspaper or a magazine publisher or a radio station with having knowledge of the product which an advertiser seeks to advertise.

Mr. O'HARA. The legislative intent of this bill is as the gentleman has stated. There is absolutely no intention in this bill to charge responsibility to the advertising medium, whether it be the radio station or newspaper.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Speaking as a member of the committee and as the

author of the bill, it was never our intention, and it is not the intention of the bill, to refer by using the term "advertising" in the bill to the advertising medium. The responsibility is on the person who seeks to do the advertising and no one else.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me say that it is the intention not in any way in this bill to create any liability against the advertising medium.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I wanted to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota to the fact that the schedule on page 73 of the hearings shows that dyed rabbit appears under no less than 35 different trade names. So rabbit is the most versatile of all animals.

Mr. O'HARA. I was going to comment on the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], that I thought there were nearly 100 of them somewhere in the record. Maybe it was 35.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. After listening to the discussion by the gentleman from Minnesota and also the gentleman from Louisiana as to muskrat and rabbit and the different gradings, can the gentleman give the House any information on the different grades of mink?

Mr. O'HARA. There was a statement made here that I am some sort of an expert. I am not. Of course, in any fur, let me say to the gentleman, one of the most valuable things you have is a good skin. In other words, you might have a poor muskrat skin and it would make a poor muskrat coat, or a poor mink skin and it would make a poor mink coat. The importance lies in the grading.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. NELSON. Is it the gentleman's understanding that section 3 of the bill, on page 4, permits a retailer to remove a manufacturer's label and substitute his own, as long as it is properly marked?

Mr. O'HARA. It is specifically in there for that purpose, and it was one of the principal objections when that provision was not in the bill by the retail level. It is a perfectly good argument, and it is so provided, let me say to my colleague.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. I was on my feet and intended to suggest the same thought as did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], who said that the specie of muskrat might come in four or five different prices, and he said in an undertone as though it was being palmed off. I am sure the gentleman does not so intend. Shoes are made out of cowhide, all of them, or most of them, but they command different prices, as is

also true of mink and ermine, and I hope it was not intended to leave in the record that thought, because the design, the use of the animal, the size, the age, and so on, all these things affect the price. I hope the gentleman will concede that to be so.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is completely right about that.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. So far as I have learned from the discussion thus far, there is no real opposition to the fundamental principle of this legislation, namely, that the public should be protected by truth in fur labeling. This bill has had the consideration of two or three Congresses and at one time actually passed the House.

The legislation is not a partisan issue in any sense. It has had exhaustive consideration by the Commerce Committee of the House. I was a member of the subcommittee which considered this legislation. We heard all segments of the industry, the producers, the processors, the manufacturers, and the retailers. saw numerous exhibits of the abuses to which the fur industry is now subject by reason of the fact that there is no limitation apparently, no legal limitation certainly, upon the facts about what the fur coats are made of.

This House would be astounded, even appalled, at some of the misrepresentations which were disclosed before our committee, both in advertising and in labeling. This is, perhaps, not an earth-shaking or destiny-making proposition, but it does do something for one segment of our great economy in this country. It provides that the small minority of those who are engaged in the fur trade shall be brought into line and required to tell the truth as to what their product is. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The question was asked a moment ago as to whether or not a retailer would have the right to remove a label and substitute one of his own. I believe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] said that that was true. Does the gentleman know what part of this bill would authorize the retailer, as he received the product, to remove the label and substitute one of his own, which may in truth or in fact tell what the true contents of that article is?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think that will be found in subsection (e) on page 5.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. On page 5, subsection (e) states:

Any person introducing, selling, advertising, or offering for sale, in commerce, or processing for commerce, a fur product, may substitute for the label affixed to such product pursuant to section 4 of this act—

Is that the authority the gentleman says gives the retailer the power to take out one label and substitute another?

Mr. DOLLIVER. My answer is in the affirmative, but he must substitute a label which reveals the kind of fur it is.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman will yield, may I suggest to the gentleman that in virtually every case it would be in commerce. I would suggest that the authorization would have to be in commerce.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. What is the effective date of this act? I have in mind the position of dealers who have large stocks of furs, fur parts, and overcoats on hand. Are they going to be subject to the sanctions of this statute?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The effective date is one year after its enactment.

Mr. WILLIS. Suppose one has a stock on hand that is going to last him 5 years. Then is he going to be a law violator, when he bought the merchandise in good faith?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think our testimony shows that probably 1 year would satisfy the requirements of the trade.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to answer specifically the question of the gentleman from Louisiana. Section 7 provides the Name Guide is brought out in 6 months by the Federal Trade Commission under this bill. Under section 14 the act does not take effect until 1 year after its passage, except for section 7.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield, do I correctly understand in connection with the answer that was given a moment ago as to section 3 (e) that this would cover the question of what is in commerce, and that the interpretation the gentleman places upon it is that anything that may have been shipped in commerce and brought to an end you still have jurisdiction over so far as this act is concerned?

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs. It is a good bill and I support it. I am certain, however, that the sponsor of the measure and his colleagues on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are aware of the fact that there are other articles that are being imported and sold to the public as things they are not.

I have in mind the thousands of foreign sewing machines that are now coming into our country from abroad, sewing machines that are not properly marked as to indicate the country of origin, others that are so marked that the markings can readily be concealed through the placement of other parts or attachments, some whose markings are here covered by plates or labels bearing

well known American names, all calculated to defraud a too-often gullible buyer.

There is domiciled in Passaic, N. J., in my congressional district, a red-blooded veteran of World War II, who has been making his living through a store in which he retails sewing machines of American make. Months ago he sensed the threat to his business and he began a one-man crusade, frequently taking him to Washington and other parts of the country, in an effort to force proper foreign markings on imported machines and to stop fraudulent advertising of the same. He came to me and I had him meet with representatives of the Federal Trade and Tariff Commissions, the Bureau of Customs. He had the goods, the proof, and all who heard him and saw his exhibits, admitted this. Several cases were instituted by Federal Trade and it is now expected final action will be had shortly. Meanwhile, I have introduced a bill which, I hope, will have the early consideration of the committee now bringing the fur measure before us. This would require foreign markings that cannot be concealed by any operations on this side.

Several times during my constituent's crusade, even while he was exercising his American right of petition, he has had phone calls, usually in the nighttime, from unknown parties threatening to blow his brains out if he did not cease mixing in this foreign import business. Nine days ago my constituent was criminally assaulted in his home city shortly after he had closed his store at night. Red pepper was doused into his eyes and he was taken to a local hospital for treatment. Doctors say he will be required to take frequent eye baths and wear dark glasses for many weeks.

The case has given me much concern and while the Federal Bureau of Investigation does not seem to have any jurisdiction I know the Bureau has looked into the case and it is distinctly my intention to bring my constituent before the Senate Crime Committee if there is any more of this hoodlum stuff. It is possible that the committee might find a new type of racket threatening the future of many American businessmen and workers.

I do hope that the committee will give consideration to my bill and the plight of others, manufacturers, retailers, and consumers, injured by these fraudulent and nefarious undertakings.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I think it ought to be clear to the House that this bill will not entirely eliminate the problem in our major cities, whether it is Milwaukee, Minneapolis, or Omaha, Neb., or Denver, Colo., where there is a manufacturer making the garments within his own shop and selling them on the local market. He is not necessarily covered by this legislation, is he?

Mr. O'HARA. If the fur product itself is raised and processed within the State and is not transported in interstate commerce, the gentleman's comment is correct.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I call the gentleman's attention to section (c) appearing on page 12, wherein it is stated:

The Commission is authorized to cause inspections, analyses, tests, and examinations—

In the event some furs are picked up for the purpose of making examination, is the person who owns such furs compensated in any way for them?

Mr. O'HARA. I would think so. I do not think the Government would have any right to confiscate those furs, except under authority of a prosecution. But if it is for the purpose of making tests, certainly they would either have to be returned in substantially the same condition as when they were taken, or there should be a responsibility on the Government to compensate the owner of the furs for the value of them.

Mr. YATES. Is there provision for such reparation in the bill at any point?

Mr. O'HARA. No; there is not.

Mr. YATES. But it is the intention of the committee, in the event that is done and a loss is suffered without fault on the part of the vendor, that proper reparation be made by the Government to the vendor?

Mr. O'HARA. I think that would be no more than absolute simple justice. Reparation should be made.

Mr. YATES. That would be true, as well, with respect to section 9 appearing on page 13, where proceedings are started against furs, condemning such furs, and in the event there is deterioration and a not-guilty verdict is returned, should not the Government compensate for any loss occurring there as well?

Mr. O'HARA. I will say frankly to the gentleman that question did not occur to me or to any member of the committee or any witness that I know of when the matter was under discussion and neither did any of the many witnesses who appeared raise any point as to that so far as I can recall.

Mr. YATES. I was under the impression that furs could deteriorate if not properly stored.

Mr. O'HARA. If they are not properly stored, that is correct.

Mr. YATES. And if the Government did not properly store the furs seized pending adjudication of the case, I wonder what the compensation would be to the person damaged?

Mr. O'HARA. I would assume, in the event there was a prosecution and furs were seized and a not-guilty verdict was returned, or no cease-and-desist order issued, there would certainly be a liability upon the Government for the value of those furs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to digress just a moment to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] on bringing to the attention of the Committee here the matter with reference to the importation of sewing machines. I have had similar criticisms, excepting the violence part, which the gentleman mentioned, with

reference to such items as motorcycles. In my opinion certain dealers for American made motorcycles are having a rough time. Unquestionably this influx of products from foreign areas, so that American manufacturers are prevented from selling that which they make, is a dangerous trend at this time and I am certainly glad that the gentleman called the attention of the House to the example which he mentioned.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I have been requested by the ranking member on our side of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], who is unavoidably detained in his district today, to express his great interest in this bill, and at the proper time to obtain consent for him to extend his remarks. I am sure the gentleman from Texas knows of the great interest of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Fur Products Labeling Act."

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, business trust, or any organized group of any of the foregoing.

(b) The term "fur" means any animal skin or part thereof with hair, fleece, or fur fibers attached thereto, either in its raw or processed state, but shall not include such skins as are to be converted into leather or which in processing shall have the hair, fleece, or fur fiber completely removed.

(c) The term "used fur" means fur in any form which has been worn or used by an ultimate consumer.

(d) The term "fur product" means any article of wearing apparel made in whole or in part of fur or used fur; except that such term shall not include such articles as the Commission shall exempt by reason of the relatively small quantity or value of the fur or used fur contained therein.

(e) The term "waste fur" means the ears, throats, or scrap pieces which have been severed from the animal pelt, and shall include mats or plates made therefrom.

(f) The term "invoice" means a written account, memorandum, list, or catalog, which is issued in connection with any commercial dealing in fur products or furs, and describes the particulars of any fur products or furs, transported or delivered to a purchaser, consignee, factor, bailee, correspondent, or agent, or any other person who is engaged in dealing commercially in fur products or furs.

(g) The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(h) The term "Federal Trade Commission Act" means the act entitled "An act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes," approved September 26, 1914, as amended.

(i) The term "Fur Products Name Guide" means the register issued by the Commission pursuant to section 7 of this act.

(j) The term "commerce" means commerce between any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof;

or between points within the same State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within any Territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

(k) The term "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States.

MISBRANDING, FALSE ADVERTISING, AND INVOICING DECLARED UNLAWFUL

SEC. 3. (a) The introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into commerce, or the sale, advertising or offering for sale in commerce, or the transportation or distribution in commerce, of any fur product which is misbranded or falsely or deceptively advertised or invoiced, within the meaning of this act or the rules and regulations prescribed under section 8 (b), is unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition, and an unfair and deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(b) The manufacture for sale, sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation or distribution, of any fur product which is made in whole or in part of fur which has been shipped and received in commerce, and which is misbranded or falsely or deceptively advertised or invoiced, within the meaning of this act or the rules and regulations prescribed under section 8 (b), is unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition, and an unfair and deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(c) The introduction into commerce, or the sale, advertising or offering for sale in commerce, or the transportation or distribution in commerce, of any fur which is falsely or deceptively advertised or falsely or deceptively invoiced, within the meaning of this act or the rules and regulations prescribed under section 8 (b), is unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition, and an unfair and deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(d) Except as provided in subsection (e) of this section, it shall be unlawful to remove or mutilate, or cause or participate in the removal or mutilation of, prior to the time any fur product is sold and delivered to the ultimate consumer, any label required by this act to be affixed to such fur product, and any person violating this subsection is guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(e) Any person introducing, selling, advertising, or offering for sale, in commerce, or processing for commerce, a fur product, may substitute for the label affixed to such product pursuant to section 4 of this act, a label conforming to the requirements of such section, and such label may show in lieu of the name or other identification shown pursuant to section 4 (2) (E) on the label so removed, the name or other identification of the person making the substitution. Any person substituting a label shall keep such records as will show the information set forth on the label that he removed and the name or names of the person or persons from whom such fur product was received.

(f) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section shall not apply to any common carrier, or contract carrier in respect of a fur product or fur shipped, transported, or delivered for shipment in commerce in the ordinary course of business.

MISBRANDED FUR PRODUCTS

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act, a fur product shall be considered to be misbranded—

(1) if it is falsely or deceptively labeled or otherwise falsely or deceptively identified,

or if the label contains any form of misrepresentation or deception, directly or by implication, with respect to such fur product;

(2) if there is not affixed to the fur product a label showing in words and figures plainly legible—

(A) the name or names (as set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide) of the animal or animals that produced the fur, and such qualifying statement as may be required pursuant to section 7 (c) of this act;

(B) that the fur product contains or is composed of used fur, when such is the fact;

(C) that the fur product contains or is composed of bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored fur, when such is the fact;

(D) that the fur product is composed in whole or in substantial part of paws, tails, bellies, or waste fur, when such is the fact;

(E) the name, or other identification issued and registered by the Commission, of one or more of the persons who manufacture such fur product for introduction into commerce, introduce it into commerce, sell it in commerce, advertise or offer it for sale in commerce, or transport or distribute it in commerce;

(3) if the label required by paragraph (2) (A) of this section sets forth the name or names of any animal or animals other than the name or names provided for in such paragraph, unless such name or names are preceded by the words "Processed to simulate" and the fur product has been so processed.

FALSE ADVERTISING AND INVOICING OF FUR PRODUCTS AND FURS

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this act, a fur product or fur shall be considered to be falsely or deceptively advertised if any advertisement, representation, public announcement, or notice which is intended to aid, promote, or assist directly or indirectly in the sale or offering for sale of such fur product or fur—

(1) does not show the name or names (as set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide) of the animal or animals that produced the fur, and such qualifying statement as may be required pursuant to section 7 (c) of this act;

(2) does not show that the fur is used fur or that the fur product contains used fur, when such is the fact;

(3) does not show that the fur product or fur is bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored fur when such is the fact;

(4) does not show that the fur product is composed in whole or in substantial part of paws, tails, bellies, or waste fur, when such is the fact;

(5) contains the name or names of any animal or animals other than the name or names specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, unless such name or names are preceded by the words "Processed to simulate" and the fur product has been so processed, or contains any form of misrepresentation or deception, directly or by implication, with respect to such fur product or fur.

(b) For the purposes of this act, a fur product or fur shall be considered to be falsely or deceptively invoiced—

(1) if such fur product or fur is not invoiced to show—

(A) the name or names (as set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide) of the animal or animals that produced the fur, and such qualifying statement as may be required pursuant to section 7 (c) of this act;

(B) that the fur product contains or is composed of used fur, when such is the fact;

(C) that the fur product contains or is composed of bleached, dyed, or otherwise artificially colored fur, when such is the fact;

(D) that the fur product is composed in whole or in substantial part of paws, tails, bellies, or waste fur, when such is the fact;

(E) the name and address of the person issuing such invoice;

(2) if such invoice contains the name or names of any animal or animals other than the name or names specified in paragraph (1) (A) of this subsection, unless such name or names are preceded by the words "Processed to simulate" and the fur product has been so processed, or contains any form of misrepresentation or deception, directly or by implication, with respect to such fur product or fur.

EXCLUSION OF MISBRANDED OR FALSELY INVOICED FUR PRODUCTS OR FURS

SEC. 6. (a) Fur products imported into the United States shall be labeled so as not to be misbranded within the meaning of section 4 of this act; and all invoices of fur products and furs required under the Act of June 17, 1930 (ch. 497, title IV, 46 Stat. 719), shall set forth, in addition to the matter therein specified, information conforming with the requirements of section 5 (b) of this act, which information shall be included in the invoices prior to their certification under said act of June 17, 1930.

(b) The falsification of, or failure to set forth, said information in said invoices, or the falsification or perjury of the consignee's declaration provided for in said Act of June 17, 1930, insofar as it relates to said information, shall be an unfair method of competition, and an unfair and deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act; and any person who falsifies, or fails to set forth, said information in said invoices, or who falsifies or perjures and consignee's declaration insofar as it relates to said information, may therefore be prohibited by the Commission from importing, or participating in the importation of, any fur products or furs into the United States except upon filing bond with the Secretary of the Treasury in a sum double the value of said fur products and furs, and any duty thereon, conditioned upon compliance with the provisions of this section.

(c) A verified statement from the manufacturer, producer of, or dealer in, imported fur products and furs showing information required under the provisions of this act may be required under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

NAME GUIDE FOR FUR PRODUCTS

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall, with the assistance and cooperation of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act, issue, after holding public hearings, a register setting forth the names of hair, fleece, and fur-bearing animals, which shall be known as the Fur Products Name Guide. The names used shall be the true English names for the animals in question, or in the absence of a true English name for an animal, the name by which such animal can be properly identified in the United States.

(b) The Commission may, from time to time, with the assistance and cooperation of the Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior, after holding public hearings, add to or delete from such register the name of any hair, fleece, or fur-bearing animal.

(c) If the name of an animal (as set forth in the Fur Products Name Guide) connotes a geographical origin or significance other than the true country or place of origin of such animal, the Commission may require whenever such name is used in setting forth the information required by this act, such qualifying statement as it may deem necessary to prevent confusion or deception.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ACT

SEC. 8. (a) (1) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, sections 3, 6, and 10 (b) of this act shall be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission under rules, regulations, and procedure provided for in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(2) The Commission is authorized and directed to prevent any person from violating the provisions of sections 3, 6, and 10 (b) of this act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this act; and any such person violating any provision of section 3, 6, or 10 (b) of this act shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in said Federal Trade Commission Act as though the applicable terms and provisions of the said Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this act.

(b) The Commission is authorized and directed to prescribe rules and regulations governing the manner and form of disclosing information required by this act, and such further rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for purposes of administration and enforcement of this act.

(c) The Commission is authorized (1) to cause inspections, analyses, tests, and examinations to be made of any fur product or fur subject to this act; and (2) to cooperate, on matters related to the purposes of this act, with any department or agency of the Government; with any State, Territory, or possession, or with the District of Columbia; or with any department, agency, or political subdivision thereof; or with any person.

(d) (1) Every manufacturer or dealer in fur products or furs shall maintain proper records showing the information required by this act with respect to all fur products or furs handled by him, and shall preserve such records for at least 3 years.

(2) The neglect or refusal to maintain and preserve such records is unlawful, and any such manufacturer or dealer who neglects or refuses to maintain and preserve such records shall forfeit to the United States the sum of \$100 for each day of such failure which shall accrue to the United States and be recoverable by a civil action.

CONDEMNATION AND INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any fur product or fur shall be liable to be proceeded against in the district court of the United States for the district in which found, and to be seized for confiscation by process of libel for condemnation, if the Commission has reasonable cause to believe such fur product or fur is being manufactured or held for shipment, or shipped, or held for sale or exchange after shipment, in commerce, in violation of the provisions of this act, and if after notice from the Commission the provisions of this act with respect to such fur product or fur are not shown to be complied with. Proceedings in such libel cases shall conform as nearly as may be to suits in rem in admiralty, and may be brought by the Commission.

(2) If such fur products or furs are condemned by the court, they shall be disposed of, in the discretion of the court, by destruction, by sale, by delivery to the owner or claimant thereof upon payment of legal costs and charges and upon execution of good and sufficient bond to the effect that such fur or fur products will not be disposed of until properly marked, advertised, and invoiced as required under the provisions of this act; or by such charitable disposition as the court may deem proper. If such fur or fur products are disposed of by sale, the proceeds, less legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that—

(1) any person is violating, or is about to violate, section 3, 6, or 10 (b) of this act; and

(2) it would be to the public interest to enjoin such violation until complaint is is-

sued by the Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act and such complaint dismissed by the Commission or set aside by the court on review, or until order to cease and desist made thereon by the Commission has become final within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Commission may bring suit in the district court of the United States or in the United States court of any Territory, for the district or Territory in which such person resides or transacts business, to enjoin such violation, and upon proper showing a temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond.

GUARANTY

SEC. 10. (a) No person shall be guilty under section 3 if he establishes a guaranty received in good faith signed by and containing the name and address of the person residing in the United States by whom the fur product or fur guaranteed was manufactured or from whom it was received, that said fur product is not misbranded or that said fur product or fur is not falsely advertised or invoiced under the provisions of this act. Such guaranty shall be either (1) a separate guaranty specifically designating the fur product or fur guaranteed, in which case it may be on the invoice or other paper relating to such fur product or fur; or (2) a continuing guaranty filed with the Commission applicable to any fur product or fur handled by a guarantor, in such form as the Commission by rules and regulations may prescribe.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to furnish, with respect to any fur product or fur, a false guaranty (except a person relying upon a guaranty to the same effect received in good faith signed by and containing the name and address of the person residing in the United States by whom the fur product or fur guaranteed was manufactured or from whom it was received) with reason to believe the fur product or fur falsely guaranteed may be introduced, sold, transported, or distributed in commerce, and any person who violates the provisions of this subsection is guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice, in commerce within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

CRIMINAL PENALTY

SEC. 11. (a) Any person who willfully violates section 3, 6, or 10 (b) of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or be imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

(b) Whenever the Commission has reason to believe any person is guilty of a misdemeanor under this section, it shall certify all pertinent facts to the Attorney General, whose duty it shall be to cause appropriate proceedings to be brought for the enforcement of the provisions of this section against such person.

APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAWS

SEC. 12. The provisions of this act shall be held to be in addition to, and not in substitution for or limitation of, the provisions of any other act of Congress.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. If any provisions of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 14. This act, except section 7, shall take effect 1 year after the date of its enactment.

Mr. BECKWORTH (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I

ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and that the entire bill be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 17, strike out "or" and insert after the words "contract carrier" the following: "or freight forwarder."

Page 7, line 4, after "paragraph" strike out the comma and all that follows down through the words "processed" in line 6.

Page 8, line 6, strike out beginning with the word "unless" down through the comma in line 8.

Page 9, line 9, strike out beginning with the word "unless" down through the comma in line 11.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I offer a clarifying amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: Page 9, lines 19 and 20, strike out "the act of June 17, 1930 (ch. 497, title IV, 46 Stat. 719)," and insert "title IV of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended"; and in line 24, strike out "said act of June 17, 1930," and insert "the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended"; and on page 10, lines 3 and 4, strike out "said act of June 17, 1930," and insert "the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, briefly, this amendment has been suggested by the Legislative Counsel to make more certain to which tariff act the language of the bill refers, and it is for that purpose only that I offer it, as a matter of clarification.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2321) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs, pursuant to House Resolution 256, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] may extend his remarks in the debate on H. R. 2321.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

IT IS NOT TOO LATE TO REESTABLISH A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak today of efforts to recapture the bipartisan approach to foreign policy problems of our Nation in a period of great peril. I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], that it is more important that a policy be right than that it be bipartisan. But it is my conviction that in the year 1951 it is not likely to be right unless it is bipartisan.

Now it is hardly becoming of a Democrat to give advice to his Republican friends, and I do not wish to appear in that role today. If I speak critically of any phase of the Republican position, actual or potential, I would with equal candor speak of my own party's deficiencies. I wish very much to speak without partisanship. I recognize that it would be a mistake to make a fetish of the bipartisan plan for foreign policy, but on the other hand proposals for maximum cooperation between the parties in this period of danger must be received favorably if we are to have an adequate and predictable policy.

The advantages in our political system of having a vigorous majority opposition need not be lost and will be available if the responsible party in power should not meet its obligations acceptably. In a certain sense, the party in power can neither renounce nor share responsibility. It would be contrary to the American system to permit the majority, by sharing decisions, to escape its final responsibility for our foreign policy. At the same time we must distinguish between the execution of a policy which rests exclusively upon the administration and the determination of that policy through consultation and cooperation between the parties. The opposition is entitled to advantages growing out of gross mishandling of a policy's execution by the administration, but the opposition should seek perfection in the policy itself.

Senator Vandenberg is said to have preferred the term "nonpartisan" to "bipartisan." Perhaps he was right, but I use the term "bipartisan" because I believe that the resources to be made available through the facilities of political organizations are essential to an effective foreign policy, and since our very existence may depend on the effectiveness of that policy, we cannot indulge the luxury of ordinary political rivalry. If it is inevitable that foreign policy should become a political issue in 1952 it nevertheless would be ignoble for either party in 1951 to seek an advantage with only Presidential politics in mind.

I am more concerned, Mr. Speaker, about getting the right policy with an emphasis upon its positive phases than in convincing my colleagues on a procedural point, but both procedure and

content are important. Bipartisanship can be negative in character, and negativism would be fatal. Both parties might fail, for example, to use their best efforts before 1952, determining decisions then that should be made now. But this would mean renouncing leadership at a time when the people are eager for leadership, eager even to share new sacrifices if essential for victory and peace.

Mr. Speaker, we must find a way, through our party organizations and every other device of popular government, to end the disunity which threatens our country. I fear that the Congress may be partly responsible for the divisive influences that are powerfully asserting themselves right now and that is my reason for presenting these ideas today. Again, I insist that we do not have to give up the benefits of the two-party system with the wholesome clash of opinion which it permits, but only that it is imperative that we have a new emphasis upon party cooperation in deciding foreign policy questions.

In the critical months just ahead we must avoid exploiting fears, we must dispel them. We must foreswear any advantage from the blunders of the other side—if the blundering is incidental to the pooling of our moral and intellectual resources for saving the Nation. We have moved into an era in which America is inescapably the free world's leader and today we are not spiritually conditioned for this role. We would be equal to it if we matched our tremendous physical and material power with the moral strength that comes with dedication to common ends, if there is team work by both organizations.

Bipartisanship in 1951 must be different from bipartisanship in 1924. Then, the mood of isolationism was upon us. I insert this footnote of political history, Mr. Speaker, primarily to remind my Democratic colleagues that our taunting the Republicans with isolationism is hardly in order. In the twenties the policies of isolationism reflected the official thinking of Democrats as well as Republicans. The 1924 convention in Madison Square Garden approved, not the forward-looking proposal of Newton D. Baker to cooperate with the League of Nations, but the weak and negative position which the isolationists in the party advanced. We must carry our share of the blame for the disasters which followed the retreat from world responsibility in that unhappy decade.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it is only because I believe that much of the confusion in popular thinking today is due to the inability of Congress to maintain bipartisan discussions, that I offer this plea for its recapture. We must not permit one party to become identified with success in Korea, for the suffering that has come from that far-away enterprise touches families of every political affiliation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is making a most interesting and important address, as he always does. We all know

him as a sincere and able advocate of the best in bipartisanship. We know that he approaches this problem with idealism and common sense. I wish to point out, however, if the gentleman would permit me, that we have gone further in bipartisan action on foreign policy than possibly meets the eye of the general public, because our accomplishments in this field in this present session of Congress have not been in the realm of controversy but in the realm of bipartisan agreement. If the gentleman would permit, I would like to call his attention to five instances in which a bipartisan, nonpartisan, dualpartisan, patriotic approach to problems dealing with our foreign affairs has been carried out with success in this House.

On January 19 the McCormack-Martin resolution, urging the United Nations to declare Red China an aggressor, was implemented and passed by the joint efforts of the leadership of both parties. The Rogers resolution, urging the United Nations to declare an embargo on Red China, passed under similar auspices, as did the Harris resolution, opposing the seating of Red China in the United Nations. The Ribicoff resolution, declaring our historic friendship for the Russian people, passed under similar auspices; and the India relief bill, after a long and tempestuous prelude, came to the floor and was passed, and the conference report was adopted with the support of the leadership on both sides of the House.

Now, the fact that we did not get into a dreadful argument over all of this has perhaps kept it from the attention of the newspapers and radio commentators, who love to tell about a fight; but I think that the gentleman from Arkansas and the House and the country can look forward with a certain degree of confidence, in view of this record that has already been made, unheralded and unsung, in the Eighty-second Congress.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very happy to have that emphasis upon the constructive side of the work of the House. I am sure that the gentleman would not disagree with my main thesis that often the task is made infinitely harder by political speeches and by an accentuating of political differences, and for that reason I am happy to have the high lights of the record that we have already made. I do not want to speak epigrammatically, but it appears to me proper to say what we need more is an atmosphere of good will in which right solutions may be sought. We need that more than the perfect answer on every specific issue. It is the atmosphere that I am directing my remarks toward more than anything else.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I simply want to amplify what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has said, with which the gentleman from Arkansas agrees. Those five measures, both resolutions and bills, are all indicative of the wide area of agreement that exists in the House. As I have stressed several times on the floor, I think the thing we should stress

is the wide area of agreement that exists, and then concentrate on the honest differences of opinion, what might be called the areas of disagreement, because when we talk about the areas of disagreement we convey to the country the impression that we are in disagreement on everything.

I well know of some of the legislation that the gentleman from Ohio referred to in connection with the collaboration of the leadership on his side, and our unanimous action. I well know of the wheat-for-India bill, and if the gentleman from Arkansas will permit me, I want to pay a special tribute, because I believe in giving credit where credit is due, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. One day I was very much disturbed; I realized that as time went on and time passed, the result of undernourishment and starvation in India would catch up and the newspapers would be filled with deaths, and I was very much disturbed in conscience about the fact that we had not acted upon the bill that had been reported out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There was a difference of opinion among members on the question of a grant. That was an honest difference of opinion and I talked with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] to get his reaction, a sort of survey. I did it in my own individual right. I told him I was not speaking to him as majority leader, but simply as JOHN McCORMACK, simply to get a survey, and I wanted him to understand it from that angle so that he would not get the impression that I was speaking to him in my capacity as majority leader. As the result of that talk there started into operation a chain of events which brought about the grant bill and the successful passage, with bipartisan or nonpartisan or dual support. Whatever you want to call it is immaterial; the fact speaks for itself, and that support resulted in the passage of the bill.

Again, as I say, I like to give credit where credit is due. I want to pay my special tribute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] not only on the other four but particularly in connection with the wheat-for-India bill.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very happy to hear the majority leader speak of his admiration for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and his appreciation of his contribution to our foreign policy. I might insist, however, that it tends to support my feeling that the expression "bipartisan" is more accurate than nonpartisan because in the instances referred to it was responsible party leadership on both sides that effectuated the results. We were not closing our eyes to the existence of the parties.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his timely remarks.

I was speaking of the fact that it would be very unfortunate if Korean successes should be flavored at all with Democratic prestige. We must not permit that to happen.

Still it could come about that the administration would gain an advantage to which it is not entitled, if unrestrained party warfare continues in certain channels. To make my meaning clear I will

quote one of the saddest things I have heard. One of Mr. Truman's critics, not a Member of the Congress, I am glad to say, once said: "It would just be this administration's luck to have the Korean war wind up victoriously." He implied that he would hate to see that happen. Some of Mr. Truman's partisans are also extremists. They would make a Korean victory the occasion for a Democratic rally.

Some of the things we might do to create a more favorable atmosphere in which to legislate are these:

First. Resolve that we will not permit the issues to be defined in personal terms. Administration adherents must not withhold concessions if General MacArthur is shown to be right, and on the other hand his partisans must make it a little easier for alterations to be made in our policy as events tend to supply answers to some questions. A workable bipartisan procedure would assume that the modifications in policy resulting from events as distinguished from debate would not be charged to political motives and political strategy.

Second. We must accept in the most sportsmanlike way one of the hazards of democratic life, namely, that differences between the parties and conflicts between points of view of the allied nations must be settled right out in the open. We must achieve by democratic means the power of unified effort which the Soviets gain by tyrannical means.

Third. Both sides should agree that the United States will not inaugurate a preventive war and that a world war must be avoided if possible. Both should agree that neither side will exploit fears of a global conflict or of Communist gains through irresponsible use of such terms as appeasement and war mongering.

Applied to specific problems, these mean taking a fresh look at America's policy with reference to China. We do not need to express in formal terms some of the things that we have finally reached agreement on, but it would do a lot of good if we quit talking as if there remains a breach between the parties with reference to Formosa and China's seat in the United Nations. The State Department is somewhat to blame for this collateral quarrel, for its pronouncements have been conflicting. However, on the proposition of holding Formosa and opposing admission of Communist China to the United Nations there is no question as to American official policy. Perhaps feelings have become so irritated that the Republicans find it hard to accept graciously any concessions by the administration, and the Democrats find it politically inexpedient to admit that there are alterations.

We are close enough together on other points of disagreement as to the Far East to suspend debate until 1952. Further recriminations for errors and alleged errors since 1945 can help no one but our enemies now.

And while I am enumerating some weaknesses on the administration side, may I suggest that my Democratic brethren studiously avoid claiming credit for all of the achievements on

the foreign-policy front. We have made tremendous strides toward world stability. We have produced tremendous results in the armament program and production all along the line, and the Democrats are tempted to claim credit as a political party for it, when in all honesty both parties must share it.

And I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, why the Republicans have let us claim credit for it. Perhaps a lingering sense of isolationism by some of their number has produced this timidity. Perhaps a fear that they will lose the chance to pull the Nation back to domestic concerns if the obligations of world leadership prove too much for us has forced them into this position. If I were writing the Republican platform I would have boasted more of the fact that the Marshall plan, for example—one of the pillars in our foreign policy—was produced by a Republican Congress and was made possible only because of the bold and imaginative leadership of Republican-dominated committees at both ends of the Capitol. I would boast of Republican Paul Hoffman's magnificent record as ECA Chief and of the fine work of his Republican successor—William C. Foster. I would have stressed the fact that while the Democratic administration was yielding to the drive for economy in 1948 by trimming from the Air Force appropriations money sorely needed to maintain air superiority, Republican leadership insisted on larger expenditures for this purpose. Here was world-mindedness of an admirable kind.

Let us suspend the political vendettas until 1952. Nothing would thrill the people of America more in the present danger than to find in the speeches we make and in the laws we pass evidence that we sincerely believe that politics stops at the water's edge and that we are supplying leadership, if need be, at the expense of political advantage. An alarming fact about 1951 is that fears are being exploited, that issues are becoming personalized, that we may be withholding the contribution of individuals and of political parties from the total effort required for the protection of the free world.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it will take the contribution of both parties to bring our national efforts into correct alignment with the military and economic efforts of the other free nations. It is all right for the enemy to know that there are differences between Britain and America as to trade policy, for the problem is complicated and requires discussion; it is all right for the Communists to know that America regards some of Britain's policies with reference to the oil properties of Iran inadequate—if not improper, but it is not all right for us to gloat over these conflicts and to perpetuate them at the expense of developing maximum strength for the free world. We must stand with Britain in the Middle East and elsewhere.

We should ponder the words of Secretary Finletter and General Vandenberg of the Air Force that United States air power cannot retain its deterrent influence or build greater striking power without bases to be supplied by Great

Britain and other allies. Shorn of this aid, we would be immeasurably weaker.

I will be satisfied with the answers that are finally embodied in foreign policy legislation if we operate in an atmosphere of good will, if we make a more vigorous effort to find common ground and to heal the wounds that quarreling has produced. We should not continue to embarrass our Nation's military leadership. General Collins should have been spared embarrassment in stating an honest difference of opinion with General MacArthur which he and others of the Joint Chiefs of Staff entertained over military strategy. He has been forced by questions flavored with politics to offer answers which he fears will disparage General MacArthur's efforts, yet it is his judgment as a military man that General MacArthur's place in history is secure. General Collins believes that General MacArthur's brilliant handling of the Pacific operations in World War II and his administrative successes with one of the toughest assignments one could have, the occupation of Japan, will overshadow any Joint Chief's decisions, though correct ones, overruling General MacArthur's recommendations for the war in Korea.

Unless Congress wants to take over military decisions—and nothing more tragic than this could be imagined—should we not agree that those with whom responsibility rests for military action are as loyal to this Nation's interests as we, and that they conceivably are as wise as we? It is utterly inconsistent with that view to pursue the apparent determination of some to destroy faith in our Joint Chiefs of Staff and to impair their usefulness in the transcendently important role they must continue to occupy.

It is more important, Mr. Speaker, that we attempt in good faith to recapture the atmosphere in which right solutions may be sought, than that we come up with the perfectly correct answers to some of the questions that harass us, questions that will not be answered for a long, long time. Even though the Korean phase of this period of world tension should immediately terminate, we will be struggling with the problem of national security for many years. Surely we can agree that Korea is only one part, although a highly significant part, of a long and difficult world conflict.

Neither must we underestimate our strength. There is no occasion for defeatism. Granting that we of the Congress can ask on the people's part only such faith as our performance here will justify, we can nevertheless place at the top of the list of our national needs this element of restored faith, this spirit of confidence in the righteousness of our cause, and the grandeur of our military victories so far achieved.

Speaking finally as a Democrat and speaking as my Republican friends know I speak—with deep affection and respect and appreciation—is it asking too much that the opposition party help the administration open wide the door for participation in the evolving of our foreign

policy. Perhaps the Republican opposition might specify procedures for achieving a greater degree of consultation and collaboration. If they entertain doubt as to whether their views would be welcomed on the cooperative basis which I believe is possible in 1951, I hope they will tell the Democrats how we can be more effective in getting the doors opened wide for joint decisions.

Since consultation is an essential part of the bipartisan approach, it seems to me that the opposition should repudiate any in their party ranks who object to consultation through fear of responsibility. Presenting a solid front to the world is imperative now and criticism of the administration policy should be offered in a way that does not give aid and comfort to the enemy.

In all fairness, I submit that the opposition cannot afford to ignore the efforts of a few embittered members to exploit disunity and destroy confidence. Even though the temptation to do so is great, since it might appear that the impact of irresponsible condemnation harms only a democratic administration. Damage resulting from irresponsible criticism always includes the legislative, as well as the executive department. As a matter of fact, the greater damage is to the Congress and whatever our part affiliation we owe it to ourselves as legislators to guard jealously the prestige of our branch of the Government.

I know that the Democratic administration has much to answer for—that our record is not perfect. And the 1952 campaign will fully develop our mistakes of judgment, but in 1951 some public services are required that we, the majority, cannot supply. Only the Republicans can deal with the situation I have described. The decision is theirs, of course—not ours, to make. But as one Democrat, I am expressing the hope that they will give us a chance to establish the basis for cooperation. The opportunity offered the minority in this instance is one of the greatest in our history. Only the Republicans can set in motion the ideas that will give full national pride to success in Korea.

It depends, I suppose, upon whether or not we are in agreement on the basic propositions that underlie my comments today that the free world must continue to fight for its survival, and that the United States of America, the free world's leader, must find a way through its responsible party spokesmen, Republican and Democrat, to state its case to the world, and to leave no doubt in the minds of any that regardless of what happens to either political party we will fight it out along these lines. We will oppose aggression; we will not appease; we will stand by the United Nations; we will seek to perfect it; we will use our great resources in all proper ways to help stricken peoples to help themselves; we will deny the inevitability of war—not for propaganda purposes—but with our deep conviction that an honorable peace is obtainable, and we will persistently hold out that hope to the people of the world—convincing them, if possible, that with all our hearts we wish to dwell in peace with other nations. We must include in these resolutions also that we

will not expect our allies to embrace all of our policies and ideas. We will, in other words, not seek to dominate the free world but rather to inspire and strengthen it. Every major action of the Congress of the past few years has been in line with these general tenets. Therefore, both parties having shared in the preparations for this our Nation's grandest service to mankind, let both parties in 1951 give fully of themselves to a policy that will lead ultimately to success and peace.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. First may I say to the gentleman from Arkansas that there is no one in whose sincerity and good faith I put more credence. I hope that he will realize that I am speaking in a temperate vein, and also in extreme good faith. As witness of that good faith, let me state that I personally have voted with the gentleman from Arkansas on the five measures which Mr. VOYTS pointed out as a test of bipartisanship, although I would say such votes were a test of good Americanism. However, much as I share the desire for peace; much as I realize our responsibility as a country; much as I most lamentedly decry with the gentleman from Arkansas the need for a strong purpose and direction. I wonder if he would not admit that there is in this country and in this Congress a very honest, intelligent, inspired, and responsible difference of opinion on elements of foreign policy.

I merely rise in this short time to state the wish that on both sides of the House there be expression of opinion only on conviction and certainly not through desire to make political capital; but that there be no hesitation at any time on the part of the minority on any issue to stand on its feet and say: "I cannot agree." I would say further to the gentleman from Arkansas that as a spectator I sat in the gallery during the years of 1935 to 1950 and have been always convinced that if there had been more honest criticism and more outspoken courage during those years, some of the mistakes which we are now rueing might not have come to pass. And so I ask, is there not a phrase "There is more faith in honest doubt?" I would like to be given the benefit of that honest doubt, and in the name of the colleagues who have a lack of faith in the administration and in the foreign policy of the administration, I should have the gentleman from Arkansas know that we consider it a duty to disagree when reason for disagreement rests on principle. I think that he should, and will, grant us that privilege.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, if my time has not expired—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentlewoman from Illinois for what she has said, because I do agree that the Republican Party as the opposition party should not renounce its role of critic. The fact that she and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYTS] responded in their generous way to my personal attitude, of course, confirms the feeling that it was not too bold on my part to undertake to make these suggestions today. It is a delicate matter, I realize, and I have tried to think in broadest terms in this discussion. Certainly I appreciate the gentlewoman's contribution.

Mr. Speaker, it does finally depend, as I undertook to say in my closing comments, upon our good faith, and while this sounds platitudinous, nevertheless it is true, we must make a more vigorous effort, we on the Democratic side, to open the doors of collaboration and on the Republican side to accentuate and emphasize the positive and constructive side of their criticism. I do hope in this way that we may clarify to some extent the issues shorty to be considered, so fateful in their character.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] is recognized for 30 minutes.

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON BIRTHPLACE MEMORIAL

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], presented a discourse on the floor of the House which to my way of thinking did grave injustice to a fine group of American citizens who are conscientiously trying to do a job which benefits the entire country. I refer to the group of officials and workers who constitute the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial. I do not question the intent of the gentleman who made certain charges about this organization, but I do question the source of his information. I desire to submit to this House some facts to keep the record clear.

The gentleman's remarks indicated that he thought the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial and its leader, Dr. S. J. Phillips, have no standing among colored people of Virginia and the Nation; that Dr. Phillips would personally profit from sale of land to the Government if the Booker T. Washington Hospital should be established; and that the Booker T. Washington Memorial Foundation, entrusted with the sale of the commemorative half dollars as authorized by Congress, has paid out 90 percent of its profits for salaries and only 10 percent for the humanitarian purposes of the foundation.

First, let me say that I have an especial interest in the late great Booker T. Washington, for after intensive research into the life of this noble man at the scene of his great work at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, I wrote and published a condensed biography of this illustrious educator who "lifted the veil of ignorance from his people."

I have the honor to be a member of the board of trustees of the Booker T. Wash-

ington Memorial Trade School at Roanoke, Va. On last May 16 I delivered the commencement address for this school, helping Dr. Phillips, the president, place diplomas in the hands of the 115 splendid young Negro men and women who were given degrees, many of them with high honors.

Mr. Speaker, the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial was incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, as a nonprofit organization. Its national program is based on the late Booker T. Washington's philosophy of racial understanding. Its purpose is to establish and conduct practical training centers in agriculture and industry, emphasizing the dignity of labor. Its center is at Roanoke, with other activities near where Booker T. Washington was born a slave in a little cabin on a plantation.

As to the standing of this organization, surely the gentleman from New York would never have called it in question had he been aware of the names of those serving on its board of directors. I hold in my hand a letterhead of the organization, containing those names. I note that among them are such distinguished Members of the other body of this Congress as the Senator from Virginia, Mr. BYRD, and the Senator from Ohio, Mr. TART; a total of 20 distinguished Members of this House including the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL]. The list includes also such worthy citizens as Mr. M. W. Clement, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad; Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; and Mr. Donald W. Douglas, president of the Douglas Aircraft Co. Surely such names are proof of the high esteem in which the work of this organization is held.

The list of outstanding achievements of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial is impressive. They may be summarized as follows:

First. Numerous projects have been sponsored, of tremendous value in building interracial good will.

Second. Establishment of the trade school, where hundreds of Negro veterans and others are trained as skilled workers to help meet industry's needs.

Third. Transformation of the plantation on which Booker Washington was born into a center of unselfish service, with an investment of \$100,000 in land, equipment, livestock, and so on, all of which is being used to give help and guidance to thousands of Negro farmers and their families.

Fourth. A national program among Negro citizens to combat the insidious propaganda of communism. Such a program as this springs from courage, vision, and unselfish service on the part of the leaders of the organization.

I have personally visited, on several occasions, the headquarters of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial in Franklin County, Va. I

have walked over the memorial grounds, and driven over its farming lands. I have been inside Tuck Hall which is named in honor of Ex-Governor William H. Tuck of the Commonwealth of Virginia. I have looked upon the large brick structure known as Walter B. Hopkins Hall named in honor of Hon. Walter B. Hopkins, a member of the Virginia General Assembly who was the first white man to serve as a trustee of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial. I have gone all through the memorial's trade school in Roanoke, Va. I have seen hundreds of Negro men being trained in such useful trades as auto mechanics, radio repair, carpentry, and other trades. I have viewed with admiration the beautiful brick chimneys, walks, and driveways, that were being built by students of the Booker T. Washington Memorial Trade School. I had the pleasure of talking to and with those 115 men and women who received trade certificates and diplomas from the School at its recent commencement exercises. I have a copy of the Roanoke Times which carries pictures of the graduates. Would anyone believe that such a reputable newspaper in the memorial's home State and community would send its photographers to make pictures and give all this space if that organization did not have the respect and esteem of the public generally?

As to what Negro citizens think of the birthplace memorial, I quote from a column written by the distinguished journalist, Mary McLeod Bethune, in the Chicago Defender for Saturday, January 13, 1951. Under the title "Ideals of Booker T. Washington Find New Life in Birthplace Memorial," Mrs. Bethune said:

We have never needed more the ideals of Booker Washington, and I was deeply impressed, recently, when I heard of the work being done at the birthplace of this great American, to extend basic, vocational education to the masses of Negro adults in the South.

I knew Dr. Washington intimately. He was a great help and inspiration in my own work. It cheered me to know that a group of loyal, devoted followers of the founder of Tuskegee Institute were making this attempt to carry on his idea. Directing this praiseworthy effort is Sidney J. Phillips, the alert sponsor of the Booker T. Washington Memorial half dollar. I understand that more of these historic coins have been sold than any other commemorative coin issued by the Government.

The Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial group also took the leadership in securing an appropriation of \$150,000 for the purchase of land and the development of the birthplace of Dr. Washington's scientific right arm, Dr. George Washington Carver, at Diamond, Mo. These are real achievements. They represent a sincere effort to keep alive and productive the ideals and teachings of these two great Americans.

What interests me most is the manner in which the memorial has set about achieving its aims. First, it has provided a broad base for public participation. Through a premium-sharing plan in connection with the sale of Booker T. Washington half dollars it offers to churches, clubs, sororities and fraternities, an opportunity to add to their financial reserves, for these historic, commemorative coins are legal tender like all other United States money. The Memorial's proposal to share the 50-cent premium with

organizations seems to me to be both entirely feasible and a fine demonstration of "helpfulness toward others."

In Roanoke, Va., the memorial has begun operation of the largest unsubsidized trade school in the State, for men and women who are not high school or college material. The school has its own special sphere—one greatly neglected—and does not in any way compete with high schools, and State- or church-supported schools of higher learning.

I am told that the aim of the memorial is to reach the unlettered masses who are the habitual inheritors of low-skill, low-wage jobs, raising their educational level to enable them to become competent workers at their occupations. This is a real contribution to our national welfare.

At Booker T. Washington Birthplace, Virginia, the slave cabin in which the great educator was born has been restored. The grounds have been improved, orchards planted. Crops of tobacco, wheat, corn, and sweetpotatoes yield income while furnishing practical training for youthful farmers and providing a demonstration project for the community. A start has been made toward securing pure-bred livestock. The farm is mechanized and is supervised by a competent manager.

Recently, this versatile organization has gone into the marketing of canned foods, with the idea of furnishing fresh vegetables at low prices and giving employment opportunities to hundreds of trained workers, opening up a wide, new field for men and women interested in marketing and selling.

There are so many of us at the bottom of the ladder, and so little provision is being made to build solid rungs for the upward climb of the masses. I heartily approve of the far-sighted work which Mr. Phillips and his associates have begun at the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial at Roanoke. I believe that it merits the earnest support of those who realize the need for meeting the problems of the American masses "back down the line;" the need for extending our help to those who still have those first, difficult rungs to climb.

Who is this Dr. S. J. Phillips, and what is his reputation among our citizens, white and colored alike? Strange as it may seem, I first met Dr. Phillips when he was a little boy, on his father's farm near Pike Road, Ala. As a soldier from Missouri in the First World War, I was stationed at Taylor Field, near Pike Road, for many months of my training. I spoke in a little Negro Baptist Church one Sunday, and there was Phillips, a raw-boned but intelligent youth. I lost track of him for many years, and was delighted to find in my research on Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee, that he had become an honored graduate of Tuskegee Institute, a noted educator, and a true disciple of the founder of the institute. I know that he has given of his time, his energy, his talents, and his very life to furthering the cause of Negro education in the South. As evidence of the esteem in which both Dr. Phillips and the birthplace memorial organization are held, let me quote a letter from the managing editor of that great newspaper, the Pittsburgh Courier, dated October 26, 1950:

DEAR MR. PHILLIPS: Following an exhaustive and thorough study on the part of the Pittsburgh Courier relative to the background, the aims, the future, and the ideals of your association, the Courier has decided to interest itself in your program to the extent of giving you both editorial endorsement and complete news coverage.

We feel that your project is one which should interest every American. We feel that the ideals of the late Booker T. Washington, as expressed in your literature and in the work your organization has done, should merit the whole-hearted support of the entire country and all of the business institutions who believe in the principle of helpfulness toward others.

We are happy to write this letter expressing our approval of both your organization and yourself. As time goes along, we intend to do everything in our power to awaken the interests of those whom we serve in the worthiness of your project, to the extent where they will engage in active participation. Furthermore, we hope to do all in our power to help you move the memorial coins which you will have on hand.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM G. NUNN,
Managing Editor, the Pittsburgh
Courier.

Mr. Speaker, I was greatly disturbed by the implication that Mr. Phillips or the organization he heads might profit personally from the sale of land to the United States Government in the event that the Booker T. Washington Veterans Hospital were authorized by this Congress. I hold in my hand the photostatic copy of a letter from Mr. Cam B. Perdue, commissioner of the revenue of Franklin County, Va., dated at Rocky Mount, Va., June 11, 1951, and sworn to before a notary public. I quote from this letter:

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, Inc., has three tracts or parcels of land in Franklin County, Va., assessed on the books of the office of the commissioner of the revenue in the name of Booker T. Washington Memorial, Inc., as follows:

- (1) A tract of land containing 214 acres.
- (2) A tract of land containing 247 acres.
- (3) A tract of land containing 101 acres.

Each of the above tracts or parcels of land are situate, lying, and being in Gills Creek magisterial district, Franklin County, Va.

This is further to state that S. J. Phillips is not assessed on any real estate or personal property in this county.

Given under my hand this the 11th day of June, 1951.

CAM B. PERDUE,
Commissioner of the Revenue,
Franklin County, Va.

Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-ninth Congress passed legislation authorizing the coinage of 5,000,000 Booker Washington memorial half dollars to help the program of this great organization. The Eighty-first Congress, at the request of this same Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, authorized the expenditure of \$150,000 to clear the debt on the home at the birthplace of the late George Washington Carver near Diamond, Mo., so that it might become a national shrine. Because of my interest in the education, welfare, and general progress of citizens of the colored race in America, I was invited to speak at the dedication of that shrine. I know that such humanitarian projects as this by the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial are possible because of the receipts from the sale of the memorial half dollars.

The memorial distributes thousands of leaflets in the very splendid campaign it is carrying on to prevent the spread of

communism. For the past 5 years it has carried on year-round good-will-building broadcasts over Station WROV in Roanoke, Va., and WSFA in Montgomery, Ala.—broadcasts which are designed to create greater good will and tolerance among America's people. It has distributed millions of certified plants among farmers of the southland to help farm production; it conducts Booker T. Washington community service clubs in various sections—and any one who takes time to go through the charter which governs these clubs is bound to be deeply impressed by the magnificent job that the memorial is doing to build strong, solid Americans among its people.

As to the charge that the real work of the organization is carried on with only 10 percent of the receipts from the sale of the Booker Washington coins, and that 90 percent goes to salaries, I hold in my hand a copy of a letter from Mr. W. Webb Hamill, certified public accountant, Roanoke, Va., dated June 14, 1951, addressed to Dr. Phillips, in which Mr. Hamill certifies that he compared the salaries and wages paid by the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial working fund during the fiscal years from 1947 to 1950, inclusive, with the revenues received during the same periods of time, and their relationship in terms of percentages was found to be as follows:

Fiscal year ending:	Percentage of salaries and wages to revenue
Nov. 30, 1947-----	10.31
Nov. 30, 1948-----	16.42
Nov. 30, 1949-----	24.96
Nov. 30, 1950-----	21.11

Average for entire period----- 17.17

This figure of 17.17 percent average paid in salaries and wages seems to me to be quite modest, when one contemplates the great amount of office work and travel necessary to conducting the widespread activities of the organization.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Baptist layman, for which I claim no credit, except that I try to take some modest part in religious affairs. Particularly I have been interested in movements of my church to bring about closer and more brotherly relations between people of the white and colored races, so that we may more fully exemplify the spirit of the Christian brotherhood. I hold in my hand a copy of a letter from Mr. Henry A. Boyd, secretary of the National Baptist Publishing Board, publishers of literature used widely in our Negro Sunday schools. In this letter, Dr. Boyd says to Dr. Phillips:

I have been especially interested in two phases of your work which I believe can bring gravely needed guidance to our people. One is your Booker T. Washington Community Service Club idea, the other, your efforts to help them to become more efficient workers.

When I pass through a Negro neighborhood in almost any community, I wish that my strength were twice as great, my time half as full, so that I could work with them to help make their surroundings more livable, more conducive to comfort and happiness. Your organization's idea of helping more Negroes to become skilled workers and then teaching them the fundamental principles of living through the Booker T. Wash-

ington Community Service Clubs seems to be the solution of many of our problems. If we can be of any help to you let us know.

I quote also from a letter of Dr. D. V. Jemison, president of the National Baptist Convention, to Dr. Phillips, dated May 2, 1951:

When I read of the splendid response of schools and churches over the Nation in joining with you in paying homage to the birthday of Booker T. Washington, of the Virginia Congressman that took time out of his busy life to dedicate the new building at the birthplace, which will play such a large part in advancing Negro rural life, and the wonderful job that the memorial is doing in helping adult Negroes to find a better way of life through the Booker T. Washington Community Service Clubs and their trade schools—I could not put off writing any longer.

We are rather proud of the fact that the 4,000,000 members of the National Baptist Convention have stood behind you from the beginning. Keep up the good work. Any time we can be of service, just call on us. You are doing a great work for our people.

I quote also from a letter of the Reverend W. H. Jernagin, chairman of the executive committee of the Fraternal Council of Churches in America, with headquarters here in Washington, representing 7,000,000 members of churches of many denominations. Dr. Jernagin said:

Yours is one of the organizations that is endeavoring to do that and all of us can be proud that under your guidance it has developed into the kind of forceful organization that I believe the late Booker T. Washington had in mind when he spoke of a program on which white and Negro people could stand and work together for their mutual welfare.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by quoting some words of President Phillips, in the Booker T. Washington Community Service Clubs Manual, which expresses the philosophy of those working in this splendid organization:

We believe that all men must earn for themselves the blessings which they get out of life. We also believe that the finest and best place to start earning these things is in your community. You can help it to be a finer, better community and it can help you to be a better, more useful citizen. If you are willing to work and sacrifice; to be honest, law abiding, and thrifty, you can get many of the things you want right in your own home town.

By working together for the common good you will learn to know and understand your home town people better—and they will understand and appreciate you more.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three

instances and include articles from Alabama papers.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the New York Times magazine, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$492.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a letter from a marine in Korea.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include editorials and news articles and other extraneous matter.

Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the New York Herald Tribune of this morning.

Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include excerpts from the Plain Dealer of Cleveland.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Fresno Guide.

Mr. GOLDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the bill H. R. 3639.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HEBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include several articles written by him.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a very fine analysis of the new tax bill by the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include correspondence addressed to him and his comments in reply thereto, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$410.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include several editorials.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CHUDOFF (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for Monday and Tuesday, June 18 and 19, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) for today, on account of important official business.

To Messrs. TEAGUE and EVINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for Monday, June 18, on account of official business.

To Mr. BREEN (at the request of Mr. PRICE) for an indefinite period on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

525. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain road right-of-way easements in De Kalb and Putnam Counties, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

526. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Samuel A. Wise"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

527. A letter from the Governor of Hawaii, transmitting certified copies of Joint Resolutions 15 and 36 and Acts 255 and 265, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in its regular session of 1951; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

528. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

529. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Com-

missioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

530. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii during its recent session, relative to amending the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

531. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States of displaced persons, who, upon arrival in possession of appropriate immigration visas, are found to be excludable as persons within the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

532. A letter from the Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, to safeguard the internal security by regulating the discharge of alien seamen in the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

533. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a copy of Report No. 20, pursuant to section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

534. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the financial statements and accounts of the Home Loan Bank Board and the organizations under its supervision, consisting of the 11 Federal home-loan banks, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and Home Owners' Loan Corporation, for the year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 169); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

535. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to declare title to the Chicale Day School site to be vested in the United States in trust for the Pueblo of Isleta"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

536. A letter from the Secretary, National Security Council, Executive Office of the President, transmitting certain reports as follows: National Security Council Determination No. 1, National Security Council Determination No. 2, and National Security Council Determination No. 3, pursuant to section 1302, Public Law 45 (Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951); to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

537. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGRATH: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4496. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 582).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee of Conference. H. R. 1424. A bill for the relief of T. L. Morrow (Rept. No. 583). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1087. A bill to amend title 18, section 3618, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America, to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures; with amendment (Rept. No. 584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3095. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; with amendment (Rept. No. 585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4473. (A bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 586)). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 4496. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 4497. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to provide for more effective consultation with interests affected by its administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 4498. A bill to permit the Ohio Society of Washington to erect a shelter house in East Potomac Park, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SASSER:

H. R. 4499. A bill to provide that certain women officers of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps shall have the rank of brigadier general and that certain women officers of the Navy shall have the rank of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITTHROW:

H. R. 4500. A bill granting an increase in pension to certain widows and remarried widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of legislation granting aid to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to assembly joint resolution No. 38, relating to the reopening of Birmingham General Hospital; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to senate resolution No. 310, being opposed to social-security taxes on maids and domestic help, and requesting the Senators and Representatives elected from Texas to use their utmost influence in opposition to said project; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERNOS-ISERN:

H. R. 4501. A bill for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4502. A bill for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4503. A bill for the relief of Suzanne Marie Schartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 4504. A bill for the relief of Dr. Philip Bloemsma and Mrs. Joy Roelink Bloemsma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4505. A bill for the relief of Tien Koo Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 4506. A bill for the relief of Marcel Duvivier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4507. A bill for the relief of John J. Braund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 4508. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Richard Best; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

322. Mr. HESELTON presented a resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed: As the torch of a new day lights afresh the path of duty, we bow before Thee in humility and hope. As Thou hast bound together the free peoples of the earth, with all their differing traditions and cultures in a costly struggle to preserve their threatened liberties, hold them together, we beseech Thee, in a stern resolve which can never be broken by any sinister force bent on enslaving the earth.

Hasten, we pray, through us the day of an ampler life for all, when every man shall dwell in safety among his neighbors, free from gnawing want, free from torturing fears, free to speak his thoughts and free to choose his altar of worship. Above all other acclaim or reward in these searching days we crave the assurance of Thy approving voice: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they

shall be called the children of God." We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 18, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1025) to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The message notified the Senate that the House having had under consideration the joint resolution of the Senate (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, had rejected the same.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 157. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation;

H. R. 302. An act to redefine the eligibility requirements for appointment of pharmacists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 1183. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers of their respective services;

H. R. 1733. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2321. An act to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs;

H. R. 2995. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder;

H. R. 3100. An act to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 3861. An act to extend to June 30, 1953, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct home and farm-house loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3932. An act to provide vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950;

H. R. 4000. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insur-